

HISTORY OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE GERMAN PEOPLE

VOL. VII.

Demy 8vo. 25s. per 2 Vols.

HISTORY OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE at the
Close of the Middle Ages. By JOHANNES JANSSEN,

Vols. I. and II. translated by M. A. MITCHELL and
A. M. CHRISTIE.

Vols. III.—VIII. translated by A. M. CHRISTIE.

LONDON :

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO. LTD.

HISTORY OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE AT THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES

BY JOHANNES JANSSEN

VOL. VII.

GENERAL CONDITIONS OF THE GERMAN
PEOPLE FROM THE SO-CALLED RELIGIOUS
PACIFICATION OF AUGSBURG IN 1555 TO
THE PROCLAMATION OF THE FORMULA OF
CONCORD IN 1580

TRANSLATED BY A. M. CHRISTIE



90053
13/8/08

LONDON
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO. LTD.,
DRYDEN HOUSE, GERRARD STREET, W.

1905

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.

These Volumes (VII. and VIII.) are translated from Vol. IV. of the German [Fifteenth and Sixteenth Editions, improved and added to by Ludwig Pastor].

(The rights of translation and of reproduction are reserved)

CONTENTS

OF

THE SEVENTH VOLUME

BOOK I

POLITICO-RELIGIOUS PARTY STRUGGLES FROM THE TIME OF THE AUGSBURG RELIGIOUS PEACE UP TO THE END OF THE GRUMBACH-GOTHA CONSPIRACY IN 1567.

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. TERMS OF THE RELIGIOUS TREATY OF PEACE—ATTITUDE OF THE PROTESTANTS TOWARDS THE CATHOLICS—RELIGIOUS DISSENSIONS AMONG THE PROTESTANTS, AND THEIR EFFECTS	1
Significance of the maxim ‘Whose the land, his also the religion’—Episcopate of Princes, 1-4.	
The Protestants admonished to combine against the Roman Antichrist and to avoid intercourse with the Catholics—How the Catholic youth were instructed concerning the Catholic Church, 4-8.	
Character of the religious dissensions among the Protestants—Utterances of Camerarius—The people lose all fixity of faith, 9-11.	
The Osianderite disputes and their influence on the people, 12-18.	
George Major and his opponents, Flacius Illyricus, John Wigand, &c., 18-21.	
Tilmann Hesshus and his method of controversy—Tilmann Cragius, 21-28.	
II. THE RELIGIOUS CONFERENCE AT WORMS IN 1557	29
Opinions on the effects of the Religious Conference—Protestant Diet at Frankfort on the Main—Proposal for a Lutheran Papacy—Attitude of Duke John Frederic of Saxe-Weimar—Flacius against Melanchthon, 29-34.	
Religious Conference at Worms—Acrimony between the Protestant theologians—The Jesuit Canisius—Results of the Conference, 34-45.	

CHAPTER		PAGE
III. THE FRANKFORT RECESS OF 1558 AND THE BOOK OF REFUTATION		46
<p>The Protestant Princes wish 'to establish a Christian Concord'—Melanchthon objects to a Protestant Synod, 46–48. The Frankfort Recess to serve as a rule of doctrine—But only strengthens the schism among the Protestants—Protestant hopes of King Maximilian of Bohemia, later on the Emperor—Opponents of the Recess—The 'Confutation Book of the Duke of Saxony'—War of all against all—Flacius against the Landgrave Philip of Hesse—Melanchthon, in 1559, again warns against a Protestant Synod, 48–59.</p>		
IV. RELIGIOUS INNOVATIONS IN THE PALATINATE AFTER 1556		60
<p>Elector Otto Henry against 'the Popish idolatry'—The Electoral Commissioners in the nunnery at Gnadenberg—Reports of the Electoral Inspectors on the religious and moral conditions among the people, 60–66.</p>		
<p>Religious dissensions since 1559 under the Elector Frederic III.—Hesshus and his opponents—Disputation at Heidelberg, 1560—Electoral Decrees, 67–72.</p>		
<p>Religious innovations of the Count Palatine Wolfgang of Zweibrücken, 72–73.</p>		
V. RELIGIOUS INNOVATIONS IN WÜRTTEMBERG UNDER DUKE CHRISTOPHER		74
<p>Christopher on his supreme spiritual authority—Christopher under suspicion of heresy with the Duke—The Württemberg Creed of 1559—The new doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ's body—The Theologian Brenz and his tolerance, 74–77.</p>		
<p>Christopher's work of secularisation—Fuller details on the treatment of nunneries—A contemporary on the prevalent oppression of consciences and the general condition of things, 77–92.</p>		
VI. POSITION OF THE EMPIRE—THE ECCLESIASTICAL RESERVATION—THE AUGSBURG DIET OF 1559		93
<p>Increasing weakness of the Empire and the decay of German national vigour—Insecurity of trade and commerce—Complaints of the towns at the Diet of Ratisbon, 1557—Turkish danger, 93–96.</p>		
<p>The Protestant Princes declare the Ecclesiastical Reservation to be the most important point at issue in the Empire—Why King Ferdinand was opposed to its abolition, 96–104.</p>		

CHAPTER		PAGE
Ferdinand's election to the Imperial throne, 1558—Contention thereon with Pope Pius IV., 104–105.		
Diet at Augsburg, 1559—Proceedings of the French in the Empire—Transactions concerning the Imperial domains that had come into the possession of France, 105–111.		
Conquest of German territory by Russia—Loss of Livonia—The Turkish question, 111–118.		
Embitterment between the Imperial Estates—The Landsberg League—Politics—Ecclesiastical transactions at the Diet—The Emperor again refuses to abolish the Ecclesiastical Reservation—Attacks against the Catholic Estates—Towns where different creeds were allowed, 118–133.		
Violation of the Religious Peace by Protestant Estates—Plan of a general political League against the Catholic Estates—Why Melanchthon advised against such a League and a general Protestant Synod, 133–138.		
VII. MELANCHTHON ON THE RELIGIOUS DISSENSIONS AMONG THE PROTESTANTS—HIS DEATH IN 1560—THE FLACIANS IN THE DUCHY OF SAXONY		139
Melanchthon's distress and anger—His utterances concerning the growing corruption of religion and morality, and the degeneracy of the young—His death—Rowdy students destroy his house—Fury of his opponents, 139–143.		
Flacians at the University of Jena—Proceedings of Duke John Frederic against heretical theologians—‘Bitter party divisions’ at Jena, 143–147.		
Religious Conference at Weimar—Flacius declares original sin to be the substance of human nature—Opponents of the Flacians—Wonders and portents, 147–150.		
VIII. RELIGIOUS AND MORAL ANARCHY IN AUSTRIA		151
Effects of evangelical freedom—Decay of the higher and lower clergy—Reports on the inspection of convents—How the nobility made use of the new evangel—Ferdinand on the pure Word of God—Sectarianism in Austria, 151–167.		
IX. RELIGIOUS AND MORAL ANARCHY IN BAVARIA AND IN ECCLESIASTICAL TERRITORIES		168
Spread of the new doctrines in Bavaria—Increasing decay of Church discipline—Negligence of the bishops—The noble prebendaries—Concubinage—Attitude of Duke Albert V.—Disturbances on account of the lay chalice—Reports of the Church inspectors of 1558 and 1559—Demoralisation of the people, 168–180.		

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Disastrous conditions in the Archbishopric of Salzburg, the Bishoprics of Bamberg and Würzburg, the Abbacy of Fulda, &c. &c.—Causes of the demoralisation, 180–186.	
	Religious disturbances in Treves in 1559 and interference of Protestant princes—The Nuncio Commendone on the position of the German Catholics, 187–195.	
X. NEGOTIATIONS FOR THE REOPENING OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT, 1560–1561		196
Pope Pius IV. and his efforts for reform—Announcement of the continuation of the Trent Council—Counter efforts at the Imperial Court—Ferdinand and the ecclesiastical princes in fear of the Protestant Estates—Rumours of great Popish intrigues—Plan of a Protestant Union—A pamphlet against the Council, 196–207.		
Cardinal Bishop Otto of Augsburg on the Pope's design respecting the Protestants, 208–212.		
XI. RELIGIOUS DISPUTES AT THE NAUMBURG CONVENTION OF PRINCES—THE PROTESTANTS INVITED TO ATTEND THE COUNCIL IN 1561		213
What the Protestants hoped from the Naumburg Congress of Princes—Controversies concerning the different editions of the Augsburg Confession—The earliest edition teaches ‘Popish doctrine’ concerning the Eucharist—The Naumburg Congress intensifies the disagreement between the Protestants, 213–223.		
The Papal Nuncios at Naumburg—How they were treated—Rejection of the Council—The Nuncio Commendone in Berlin, 223–231.		
Negotiations of the Nuncios with the bishops, 231–233.		
XII. REOPENING OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT IN 1562—WHY THE SPIRITUAL PRINCES OF THE EMPIRE DID NOT ATTEND IT—THE LAY CHALICE—THE MARRIAGE OF THE CLERGY—THE ‘REFORM OF THE PRINCES’		234
Zeal of the Pope—Attitude of the Protestants—Otto von Augsburg denounces the rumours that it was intended to proceed against the Protestants with poison and dagger—Fear caused by these reports keeps the ecclesiastical princes of the Empire away from the Council—The conclusions deduced from their absence—Erroneous notions, 234–241.		
Advocates of the lay chalice—Why the majority of the Council decided against it—Papal concession of the chalice—Protestant expressions of opinion on the subject, 241–246.		

CHAPTER

PAGE

Reasons for and against the abolition of celibacy—Decision of the Council, 246–253.

Necessity for thoroughgoing reform of the ecclesiastical Estate and for regulating the relations between Church and State—Bondage of the Church to Catholic rulers—Not so much the bishops as the princes and their officials control the Church government and administer the Church property—Utterances of contemporaries—Demands of the Council with regard to the reform of the princes—Discussions on the subject at the Council—A memorandum of the Government of Lower Austria—The secular rulers repudiate every curtailment of their power in ecclesiastical matters—A statement of the Cardinal-Legate Morone to the Emperor Ferdinand—Despairing utterances on the Catholic side—A consolatory utterance, 253–272.

XIII. RESULTS OF THE NAUMBURG CONVENTION—RELIGIOUS AND MORAL CONDITIONS IN NORTH GERMANY 273

Flacians in the Duchy of Saxony—Their banishment in 1561—Their manner of preaching and its effect on the people, 273–277.

Opinions from Wittenberg on the dissoluteness of morals and the contempt of all discipline resulting from the religious schisms, 277–278.

The religious commotion at Bremen and its consequences, 278–283.

Religious dissensions in Magdeburg—The Catholics no Christians—Tilmann Heshus, his followers and his opponents—The Council laid under the ban of the Church—Fear of a rising of the people—Reports on a Church visitation held in the Archbishopric in 1562–1564, 283–293.

Religious factions in the Mark of Brandenburg—Agricola on Melanchthon—Andrew Musculus and the Musculites against Abdias Prætorius and his followers in Frankfort-on-the-Oder—The students take part in the disputes—Attitude of the Elector Joachim II.—An address of the Elector to the officials and the preachers of Berlin—The Provincial Estates on the side of Prætorius, the Elector on that of Musculus—Disputes among the people concerning the Eucharist—A decision of Joachim, 293–298.

Musculus on the old Catholic times and the increasing universal demoralisation, 299–301.

Religious and moral depravity in the Duchy of Prussia—The court-preacher Funk and the adventurer Paul Scalichius after 1561—Despoiling and oppression by Duke Albert. 301–305.

CHAPTER

PAGE

Utterances of the Duke on existing conditions—His death in 1568—The invalid Duke Albert Frederic—Bishop Mörlin and his opponents—Controversy between Bishop Hesshus of Samland and Bishop Wigand of Pomerania on the humanity of Christ *in abstracto* and *in concreto*, and the people's participation in this controversy—Hesshus and his adherents banished—Wigand's government—His complaints of the epicurean sensuality of the people and the despoiling of the churches—Hesshus against the Calvinists, 305–312.

XIV. CALVINISM IN THE PALATINATE 313

Elector Frederic III. against the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist and against the Würtemberg Ubiquists—His utterances on the manner of life of the Protestants, 313–315.

Electoral ordinances against ‘witchcraft and idolatry’—The Calvinistic Heidelberg Catechism of 1563—An epistolary utterance of Frederic, 315–317.

Treatment of nunneries—The Elector's profanation of churches, 317–323.

Lutheran Estates on Frederic and his Calvinism—Religious conference at Maulbronn in 1564, and its consequences—Frederic's appeal to the Religious Peace, 323–328.

XV. RELIGIOUS ATTITUDE OF MAXIMILIAN II. UP TO 1566—
TRANSACTIONS CONCERNING CALVINISM IN THE PALATINATE 329

Maximilian's leaning to the Augsburg Confession—His court-preacher Pfaußer—His duplicity in matters of religion—His solemn promise to his father, Ferdinand, before his election in 1562—His remarks about ‘the Palatine poison’—Elector Frederic explains to him the duties of the kingly office—Duke Christopher of Würtemberg and other Lutheran princes wish to proceed against the Palatine Calvinism, 330–344.

XVI. RELIGIOUS TRANSACTIONS AT THE DIET OF AUGSBURG IN 1566
—WHETHER CALVINISM IS INCLUDED IN THE RELIGIOUS
PEACE? 345

The Elector Palatine Frederic demands the extirpation of the Catholic Faith—Transactions between the Protestant princes before the Diet, 345–348.

The Imperial proposal at Augsburg—Duplicity of the Emperor—Libellous pamphlet of the Protestant Estates against the Catholics—They insist on the suppression of

CONTENTS OF THE SEVENTH VOLUME

xi

CHAPTER		PAGE
Popish idolatry by a national council—Opinion of a Catholic respecting such a council, 348–356.		
The Protestant princes demand the abolition of the Ecclesiastical Reservation; the Protestant towns object to this demand, 356–360.		
Reply of the Catholic Estates to the libellous pamphlet of the Protestants, 358–361.		
Petitions of complaint against the Elector Frederic—The Emperor's decision—Frederic's answer, 361–364.		
Double-faced attitude of the Elector Augustus of Saxony—Frederic freed by it from his perilous situation—The Emperor's explanations—His utterances concerning the wavering Lutheran Estates—Results of the Diet, 364–376.		
XVII. THE GRUMBACH-GOTHA CONSPIRACY—A LUTHERAN EMPIRE PROJECTED		377
Plans of Duke John Frederic of Saxony—The Grumbach plottings—Murder of the Bishop of Würzburg, and the general insecurity—The Grumbach conspiracy and the appearance of the Angels—The Emperor Ferdinand and the Catholic Dukes of Brunswick and of Bavaria to be assassinated—Würzburg captured in 1563, 377–384.		
Fear of a general war of the nobles <i>à la Sickingen</i> —Alliance of the princes—Grumbach's manifesto—Hopes of Duke John Frederic—His pronouncements on the arts of Satan—The Angels announce the elevation of the Duke to the imperial throne—How the Emperor Maximilian was befooled—Grumbach means the Elector of Saxony to be murdered, 384–391.		
Grumbach and his associates outlawed in 1566—A memorial for the organisation of a <i>Bundschuh</i> —The banner of the League—How the overthrow of the imperial constitution and the establishment of the true evangel is thereby to be accomplished, 391–394.		
Military expedition against Gotha—Barbarous punishment of the conspirators—John Frederic in captivity—The Emperor on the significance of the defeated rebellion, 394–401.		
INDEX OF PLACES		403
INDEX OF PERSONS		409

HISTORY
OF
THE GERMAN PEOPLE
AT THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES

BOOK I

POLITICO-RELIGIOUS PARTY STRUGGLES FROM THE TIME OF THE AUGSBURG RELIGIOUS PEACE UP TO THE END OF THE GRÜMBACH-GOTHA CONSPIRACY IN 1567

CHAPTER I

TERMS OF THE RELIGIOUS TREATY OF PEACE—ATTITUDE OF THE PROTESTANTS TOWARDS THE CATHOLICS—RELIGIOUS DISSENSIONS AMONG THE PROTESTANTS, AND THEIR EFFECTS

ACCORDING to the wording of the Recess, the so-called Religious Peace of Augsburg, of September 25, 1555, had been concluded for the purpose of removing ‘the fatal mistrust which prevailed throughout the Empire, of restoring tranquillity and mutual confidence among the Estates and their subjects, and of preserving the German Empire from dismemberment and ruin.’

But, as a matter of fact, the Treaty left the ‘subjects’ altogether out of consideration. This peace had not been concluded between Catholics and Protestants generally, but between the princes who still adhered to the Catholic faith and those who had subscribed to the Confession of Augsburg, and who by this compact mutually pledged themselves not to molest each other in future on account of religion.

As for the people, they had no alternative but to accept the religion of their rulers. In case of their refusing to do so, the sole right conceded them was to sell their possessions and migrate to some other land where they might hope for tolerance. Of liberty of conscience and religion for individuals there was no longer any question.

Among the Estates which adhered to the Augsburg Confession, the maxim ‘*Wessen das Land, dessen auch die Religion*’¹ (whose the land, his also the religion) had already long held practical sway before it received legal sanction from the Treaty of 1555. This stipulation was the most important one in the Recess of Augsburg. The most insignificant of the overlords now felt justified in dictating the religion of his subjects, and in carrying out verbatim all those regulations concerning the rights and duties of the civil authorities which the Strasburg preacher Capito had laid down decades ago in a pamphlet addressed to the Count Palatine Rupert. Every prince, Capito had said, is head of the Church in his own territory, placed there by Christ as His vicegerent. To his ‘power of the sword’ everything must give way; to him are subject religious teaching and the forms of public worship, the priests,

¹ ‘Cujus regio, ejus religio.’

and the preachers, and all their official functions. ‘Children do not belong so much to their parents as to the State.’ Every prince has the right, and is in duty bound, to do away with the Catholic worship, and to introduce the new religion by main force. Whoever continues to tolerate the Mass in his dominions is no better than the infidel Turk. Let haste, then, be made to exercise the utmost rigour against this ‘abominable blasphemy ;’ punishment by death must even be resorted to in the case of obdurate recusants, and the Catholic religion must be hunted down inquisitorially into its most secret hiding-places. Bearing in mind this unlimited power of the authorities, no one has cause to complain of coercion of conscience, for it is merely a question of submission in externals ; into the recesses of the conscience the arm of the State does not extend.¹

There was another clause in the Augsburg Treaty of Religious Peace which the Protestant princes regarded as an ‘intrinsic reason’ for their establishment of territorial churches, and for their enactments with regard to doctrine, worship, and ecclesiastical legislation and jurisdiction. This was a stipulation to the effect that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of bishops was to remain in suspension, in the States of the Augsburg confessionists, until a reconciliation in religious matters had been finally accomplished. On the strength of this the Protestant princes assumed a legal right to act as bishops in their own territories, and to exercise episcopal authority in the appointment of the clergy and in decisions concerning Church customs, ordinances, and ceremonies.

¹ See Döllinger’s *Reformation*, ii. 12–13, and N. Paulus, *Die Strassburger Reformatoren und die Gewissensfreiheit* (Strasburg, 1895), pp. 31–40.

The policy of these prince-bishops was directed towards the complete abolition of Catholic religious liberty. Under their sway there grew up in the Empire as many churches as there were Protestant territories ; and these churches did not become incorporated in one great organic system or body, but remained separate units, independent of—for the most part inimically opposed to—each other, and united only in their common antagonism to the ‘accursed Antichrist, the Pope at Rome, and his rabble of followers.’

‘In this one thing,’ says a pamphlet of the year 1558, ‘all evangelical Christians should agree in a brotherly manner (however greatly they may differ and wrangle about much else)—viz. to curse the Antichrist from their hearts as a true son of perdition, and to flee from and eschew, as far as in them lies, all intercourse with the execrable Papists, who are the servants of Antichrist and of idolatry, lest they be defiled by them. And this they must do out of Christian mercy and pity, according to the injunctions of Holy Writ, in order that the Papists may be brought to see in what a mire of idolatrous filth they are wallowing, and may perchance be turned away from it.’¹

The decision recorded in a ‘Christian and pious memorandum’ drawn up at a Hessian general synod (also in 1558) served as a pretty general rule of duty among the Evangelicals: ‘Whereas the open and avowed adherents of the Papacy are blasphemers, idolaters, and servants of Antichrist, they must not only nevermore be countenanced as sponsors at Evan-

¹ *Der abgöttische Baalsdienst der Papisten und die ernsthaften Pflichten eines evangelischen Christen, aus Gottes heiligem Worte dargestellt,* (without locality, 1558), B². C⁴.

gelical christenings, but also, according to the command of the Apostle, all outward fellowship with them must be avoided.' 'We must flee from their presence,' said the superintendents ; 'we must shun their conversation in worldly matters ; we must neither eat with them nor drink with them ; and when we meet them in the road we must not salute them.'¹

Behaviour of this kind was not consonant with the injunction of the Religious Treaty that the religious disputes must be settled by friendly and peaceable ways and means. 'Each and all,' so ran the words of the Treaty, 'whatever their differences of creed, must entertain kindly feelings towards the others in true friendship and Christian love.'

But it was Duke Christopher of Würtemberg who expressed the true feelings of nearly all the Protestant princes when he said, in a letter to the Landgrave of Hesse : 'If a Christian prince'—*i.e.* a Protestant prince—'contracts a political alliance with Catholic princes, it is as much as openly defying God Almighty. It would be only right and fitting to say to such an one what Jehu said to Jehoshaphat, who had allied himself with the godless King Ahab : "Thou helpest the ungodly, and thou art joined in friendship with them that hate the Lord."'²

The first thing aimed at all over Germany in the religious training of youthful Protestants was to fill

¹ In Heppe, *Generalsynoden*, i., *Urkundensammlung*, pp. 3–10. See i. 33–34. In the year 1593 it was decided by a synod at Cassel that 'we must keep at a distance from the idolatrous papistical service of baptism ;' the preachers were enjoined to warn the people from the pulpit not to act as sponsors at the 'idolatrous masquerades' (*Zeitschrift für hessische Gesch. und Landeskunde*, vi. 322–323).

² Sattler 4, *Beilagen*, pp. 161–162.

them with the deepest abhorrence of the ‘godless Papists.’ Luther had led the way in this direction. The whole Church, he had said, until the advent of his gospel, had been scourged and devastated by the devil ; a den of murderers had usurped the place of the Church of Christ. For centuries past Satan had governed the whole of Christendom in lieu of Christ, whom he had de-throned. The Pope had set himself up as the vicegerent of the devil ; the bishops were apostles of the devil ; the monks the creatures of the devil ; the Mass was the greatest of all abominations, a dragon’s tail (*sic*) ; purgatory was a phantasm invented by the devil. In his larger Catechism also he piled up the bitterest invectives against everything that displeased him in the Catholic Church. He declared, for instance, that no Papist had ever recognised Christ as Lord, or the Holy Ghost as the Sanctifier. ‘Before my gospel was preached we were verily children of the devil, like unto the heathen who have never heard of God and Christ.’ In the passage where he insists on the necessity of not neglecting prayer, he goes on to say : ‘Hitherto people have been instructed in such a fashion (in the devil’s name) that they have said their prayers by rote without any attention or thought, and have considered it sufficient, simply to have gone through the task ; God might answer them, or He might not.’ The Papal chair at Rome, with all appertaining to it, was ‘the head and chief protector of a set of thieves ; it had accumulated by dishonest means the property of the whole world, and it retained it all to this very day.’¹

In complete travesty of the teaching of the Catholic

¹ The larger Catechism in the *Collected Works*, pp. 20, 37–38, 74, 101–103. See pp. 90, 108, 110–111.

Church, Protestant children were indoctrinated in the belief that Catholics were wholly given up to idolatry. In the Mecklenburg Catechism, for instance, it was stated that ‘the Papists teach that we should not adore God only, but also invoke the dead.’ To the question, ‘What is Antichrist?’ the children had to answer: ‘Antichrist is the whole of the Papacy, which was founded by the devil, and which perverts the teaching of Christ, compels men to adore dead saints, forbids marriage and many sorts of food, and goes straight to hell with all those of its followers who are not converted.’¹

A Protestant preacher writes as follows: ‘It must be instilled betimes into the minds of our young Christian folk that the Papacy is nothing but rank idolatry of a more scandalous nature than that of the Turks and the heathen. The stupid Papists, as Luther teaches in his Catechism, have turned God into a sham god and ridiculous idol; they have exalted themselves as gods; they are bound to adore, as a god, their idol at Rome, the incarnate Antichrist, and to give divine honours to all the filth which emanates from him above and below. Who is there that would not be incensed at hearing that these people set no value on the merits of Christ, that they go so far as to mock and hate the Saviour, and fancy they can take heaven by storm with their own good works? It is the most monstrous kind of idolatry, the most outrageous robbery of the Almighty; it is

¹ The smaller *Corpus Doctrinæ* of Matthew Judex, a catechism of Mecklenburg: a literal reproduction from the Rostock edition by C. M. Wiechmann (Schwerin, 1865), Chapters xxii. and xxxii. It affords the publisher ‘heartfelt pleasure’ to make ‘once more accessible to the public’ a book whose purport it was for more than a century ‘to impress Luther’s pure doctrine on the minds of children.’

rascalism beyond all rascalism that has ever been heard of since the beginning of the world.¹ The preacher, Andreas Fabricius, gulled the populace into the belief that it was a leading article of the Catholic faith that the Pope was half God, half man ; that he had power over angels and devils to do, or leave undone, whatever he willed ; and that he made a point of having unlearned men for his priests, who knew no catechism whatever ; and that these priests believed neither in a God nor in a devil, neither in the resurrection of the dead, nor in heaven or hell.²

Doctor Bartholomew Kleindienst complains, in the year 1560, that ‘such is the extent to which the poor people are deluded that they believe that we present-day Catholics, or Papists as they call us, think nothing of Christ ; that we adore the saints as gods—yea, verily, that we regard the Pope as very God ; that we wish to wring heaven from God by our good works, without the help of His grace. They are taught that we do not believe the Holy Scriptures, that we have no true Bible, and that we could not read it if we had one ; that we trust more in holy water than in the blood of Christ. They invent all manner of abominable, blasphemous, and unheard-of lies against us. Intelligent people are well aware how skilfully they wield their weapons of deceit to make the common people, otherwise so well

¹ In the pamphlet already cited at p. 4, note 1, D².

² ‘Der Heiligen Teufel,’ in the *Theatrum Diabol.*, pp. 150-151. For the space of forty years the people had been preached to in this sort of way concerning ‘the devil’s work of the Papacy,’ and yet, said Fabricius regretfully, the old ideas were still deeply ingrained in the Protestant people, in spite of the ‘shining light of the Gospel.’ The common people, he said, were so saturated with the old hypocrisy that one sermon alone would suffice to bring them back again to the Papacy.

affected, loathe the Papacy as an execrable monstrosity. I cannot sufficiently deplore the fact that the poor ignorant masses have been so long unmercifully deceived and led astray by this fool's bridle. In my opinion it is a work most pleasing in the sight of God, and most beneficial to man, to show Christian pity and sympathy for these wretched, deluded, misguided people ; to pray for them devoutly, and to wish them and show them all the good we can.'

But while the ancient uniform Catholic faith was being thus made hateful and despicable in the eyes of the German people, there were springing up in all directions so many new teachers and new sects, each claiming to be 'the best and the only evangelical one,' that the common people scarcely knew any longer 'what they ought to believe.'¹

Hundreds of statements from Protestant lips bear witness to the truth of this.

So long as the leaders and spokesmen of the religious revolution were only concerned with the overthrow of existing things, the most cordial friendship seemed to prevail among them. They addressed each other alternately as new prophets and evangelists, compared each other to Elias and Elisha, to John the Baptist and the Apostle Paul. But when the time came for establishing, on the ruins of the old ecclesiastical system, a new Church in which the new evangelical doctrines should actually be embodied, then former friends became bitter foes. Amid their never-ending strife and dissensions, the

¹ *Ein recht catholisch und evangelisch Ermanung an seine lieben Deutschen* (1560) (at the end it is written 'gedruckt zu Dilingen'), B. F^o, P^s. Kleindienst was a convert (see Paulus in the *Hist. Polit. Bl.*, pp. 109, 485 ff.), and therefore particularly well versed in the matter in question.

theologians and preachers themselves appeared to lose sight of what they were aiming at, and as their want of unity extended the evangelicals became subdivided into an increasing number of small sects and parties, among which mutual recrimination and criticism was the constant rule. This was, indeed, the worst feature of the struggle. The different sects entertained no respect for each other, and credited each other with the basest motives. The Christian virtues of meekness and humility were quite left out of the reckoning.

‘I scarcely dare hope,’ wrote the distinguished schoolman and philologist, Joachim Camerarius, Melanchthon’s best friend, five years after the conclusion of the Religious Peace, ‘I scarcely dare hope, amid all this fierce and scandalous strife, that the Church will ever again attain to peace and unity. Religion, learning, discipline, and morality must all of necessity go to ruin. The whole of Germany is being brought to the ground in the most shameful manner, not by the pressure of foreign powers, but from the iniquity of her own citizens. What will other nations say of us ? or, rather, what are they saying of us already ? ’

‘It grieves me beyond measure,’ said Camerarius, with special regard to the Lutheran preachers, ‘to see how those who, above all others, are bound to stand by the Church in her extremity, and to protect her from danger, are the very ones who day by day inflict fresh wounds upon her. It is our own party that is to blame for all this misery. The fruit which would have ripened abundantly in the sunshine of unity and goodwill has all been nipped in the bud. Men, for the most part ignorant and uncultivated, impelled solely by their own insolent audacity, are fighting for their own opinions

and claiming all the time the merit of zeal for the maintenance of heavenly doctrine. Strangers or enemies to all scholarly culture, unacquainted with the writings of the ancients, and content to pin their faith to all the latest controversial pamphlets which are poured forth in shoals over the country, they abandon themselves unreservedly to their own lusts, and kick at every species of moral restraint. For very bitterness of soul I can write no more. We are confronted everywhere with such a multitude of sins that, even if there were any among us who turned their minds towards improving the general state of things, they would draw back terrified at the first step ; like the man in the fable who wanted to stop up the holes in a sieve, but could find no way either of beginning or ending the work.'¹

The nation had lost that sense of unassailable certainty which is so indispensable an element of faith, and with the loss of this their moral centre of gravity had also disappeared. The theologian, Matthias Flacius, from his home in Venetian Illyria, called Illyricus, wrote : 'We hear universal complaints of confusion in religious doctrine and perplexity in the Church, of the helplessness and indecision of professing Christians. Error and heresy are gaining the upper hand ; dissension increases and corrodes the hearts of men, and our inexperienced youth takes in the seeds of falsehood.'² The bulk of the people no longer knew what they ought to believe and what to condemn.³

¹ For these and similar utterances of Camerarius, see Döllinger's *Reformation*, ii. 586-594. 'In Germania omnia convulsa sunt,' wrote Bullinger to Calvin on March 9, 1556. *Calvini Opp.* pp. 16, 66.

² See Döllinger's *Reformation*, ii. 249-251.

³ Schumacher, ii. 276.

The duchy of Prussia, through the agency of Andreas Osiander and his partisans and opponents, had become a prolific soil of fierce dissension, which went on raging even after the conclusion of the Religious Peace.

Osiander, since 1549, had held the post of professor of theology at the Königsberg University. Taking alarm at the effects of the Lutheran doctrine of imputed righteousness, he had set up the theory that justification is not a mere imputation of the righteousness of Christ, spreading His mantle of grace over the sinner, but that it is a real indwelling of the divine righteousness in man ; that the notion of justification without regard to the condition of our souls was apt, he said, as experience showed, to make people presumptuous and reckless. ‘ Most persons who accept this doctrine,’ wrote Osiander, ‘ are despisers of authority, oppressors of the poor and the weak, usurers, liars, thieves, drunkards, and dissolute livers ; and it is very pleasant to such people to hear the hypocrites preach that “our righteousness is only reckoned unto us by God, and this, all the same, even if we are scoundrels ; that it is only outward, and not within us.”’ For, according to this, the worst sinners may pass off as saints. “ Preachers of this description are most welcome to the people ; they set Christ aside and put the devil up in His place ; they are full of envy, hatred, lying, and malice.” I wonder more than I can say that they do not themselves perceive, as even the children in the streets see plainly, that under such teaching they only grow daily more wicked and profligate.’¹

Foremost among Osiander’s opponents were Melan-

¹ Döllinger’s *Reformation*, iii. 399–412 ; Hase, *Albrecht von Preussen*, pp. 139 ff.

chthon, Flacius Illyricus, John Æpinus, Joachim Westphal, and Joachim Mörlin. These men declared his doctrine to be a snare of the devil. Satan, they said, seeing that the Papists' error of inherent righteousness had been effectually overcome by the Lutherans, resorted to more skilled tactics, and made justification consist in the essential justice of Christ dwelling in us through faith.¹

By command of Duke Albert of Prussia, Osiander published his 'confession of faith,' which, however, was pronounced in all directions an abominable and diabolical piece of work. The Duke of Saxony's theologians declared that 'we must be on our guard against it as against the pit of hell, where only fiends and demons are found.'² The Margrave Haus von Cüstrin told Duke Albert that Osiander must be shunned as the devil incarnate by all good Christians.³ Albert, however, took the new teacher under his protection. 'Under penalties affecting body and life; and by the value they set on the grace of God,' he forbade the enemies of Osiander to condemn his teaching.⁴ Supported by the friendship of the Duke and 'firm in his own opinions,' Osiander defied all his antagonists. He even dared to speak in disparaging terms of Melanchthon. Never since the apostolic days, he said, had the Church been afflicted with so pestilential a man as Melanchthon, who was so skilful in giving his teaching the semblance of genuine truth, while all the time he was in reality repudiating the truth. He called him the most shifty of theologians, and accused him of throwing dust in people's eyes with his sophistry, and of having in his writings advocated at least fourteen different doctrines of justification. At

¹ Döllinger's *Reformation*, iii. 421 f.

³ Hase, p. 188.

² Salig. ii. 996.

⁴ Vulpius, x. 46, note.

Wittenberg, said Osiander, Melanchthon carried on the most intolerable intellectual tyranny ; to secure a doctor's degree at that university it was necessary to bind oneself by oath to every word he taught. ‘ Parents flatter themselves that when their sons leave the university they are admirably equipped with sound knowledge of the Scriptures, and fitted to stop the mouths of all fanatics and heretics ; while in reality they are poor handicapped wretches, with their consciences entangled and perplexed by extorted oaths ; for they have foresworn the word of God and pledged themselves to Philip's teaching ; they have suffered themselves to be gagged by the tyrant Melanchthon. A stand must be made against the “ Wittenberg Bundschuh.”¹ Melanchthon and all his followers were downright slaves of Satan.’²

The invectives and insults which Osiander and the pastor, Joachim Mörlin, ‘ thundered out at each other from the pulpit at Königsberg’ were almost maniacal, and utterly subversive of all peace and order. They called each other reciprocally liars and blasphemers. Osiander stirred up the people against Mörlin as against a common thief and calumniator, crying out to them ‘ to arm themselves with pikes and poles.’³ Mörlin, in return, exclaimed to his congregation : ‘ If we had but the power, we would call down thunder and lightning on him and his followers, and command all the legions of devils to plague and torture them.’ Osiander, he said, was the incarnate Antichrist, through whom, in a short time, the world would come to an end. In the

¹ The peasants' lace boot and military badge in the wars of religion.

² Salig, ii. 984-986; Döllinger's *Reformation*, iii. 421-423, 426. From Osiander's *Klagen*, A².

³ Salig, ii. 948.

presence of Osiander he called out from the pulpit : ‘ Shame on thee, thou coal-black devil with thy vaunted righteousness ; may God cast thee into the nethermost abyss of hell ! ’ ‘ Do not suffer this abomination to continue in the land, dear sons and daughters,’ he said to his audience ; ‘ see to it that your children do not get poisoned by this diabolical heresy. It would be a thousand times more profitable for you to wallow in blood up to your knees, to have the Turk at your gates massacring you all ; yea, it would be more profitable to you to become Jews or pagans than to put up with what you are now suffering from. For by this teaching you are in as great danger of damnation as are the heathen. He who will not be warned, let him go straight to the devil ! ’¹

Osiander no longer felt his life safe. Whenever he went out, he had a servant following him with a loaded musket under his coat. He even carried arms with him to the lecture-hall and the pulpit. His enemies caused it to be set about that Osiander was always accompanied by ‘ two devils in the form of black dogs, who were not seen by everybody, and that he had one devil that always wrote for him in an upper room while he was eating and drinking downstairs with his companions.’²

Among the people everything was altogether topsy-turvy by reason of hatred and ill-will. Brothers, cousins, the best friends and neighbours, would spit at each other in the public streets and cry out : ‘ Shame

¹ Salig, ii. 966–967 ; Hase, 179–180 ; Döllinger’s *Reformation*, ii. 454. See Duke Albert’s letter of October 4, 1551, to his son Philip of Hesse, in Neudecker, *Neue Beiträge*, i. 2–7 ; Mörlin to John Frederic of Saxony in *Erläutertes Preussen*, ii. 660.

² Salig, ii. 1013.

on you ! be off with you, you devil, you Osianderite ranter, heretic, traitor, rascal, scoundrel, villain ! ' Riots were of constant occurrence in and outside Königsberg. ' One party contended against the other with lies, riot, and murders in order to oust them from and to seize their property. Whoever should attempt to describe all the misery that was rampant would fill an extraordinarily large book. It is not possible indeed to record all the quarrelling and ill-feeling that existed.'¹

The fashion which prevailed at this time of preaching almost solely about the devil and his wicked deeds, of making his Satanic majesty the author and the cause not only of heresy, but also of thunder and hailstorms, of the destruction of crops, of epidemics, murder, man-slaughter—of this man's broken neck, of that one's lunacy—resulted in the people's coming to believe that it was no longer God but the devil who ruled the world ; and when Osiander died in 1552, and it was said of him that on his death-bed he had bellowed like an ox possessed by the devil, and that the devil had twisted his neck and torn his body in pieces, there was little doubt in the popular mind that all this rubbish was gospel truth.² In order to refute this report, Duke Albert caused Osiander's corpse to be disinterred and examined by a jury, and the verdict that it had not been torn to pieces to be made publicly known.³ To protect the corpse from outrage the Duke ordered

¹ Salig, ii. 966. The *Königsberg Chronicles*, published by Meckelburg (Königsberg, 1865), p. 272. See v. Lilieneron, *Mittheilungen aus dem Gebiet der öffentlichen Meinung, &c.*, in the *Transactions of the Historical Section of the Bavarian Academy of Science*, xii. 120.

² *Bericht von allerlei Zauberei, Besessenheit und Teufelskünsten* (Lich, 1583), p. 17 ; Hartknoch, pp. 353-354.

³ *Bericht &c.*, p. 18.

that it should be dug up privately and carried away afterwards to some secret spot.¹

The dissensions still went on after Osiander's death. The Duke issued a fresh mandate upholding Osiander's doctrine of justification, and ruling that it should be taught in Prussia. He also prohibited the practice of slandering and anathematising from the pulpit. Mörlin, however, declared in a sermon that 'nobody must think of obeying this mandate, for it was neither reasonable nor human, but an emanation from Satan himself. He intended, he said, to speak and to preach against it so long as he was able to open his lips.'² In consequence of this appeal to sedition he was banished from the land, and at the Königsberg University all Osiander's opponents were deposed from office. The philosophical faculty was thus almost completely broken up.³

The same reason that had influenced Andreas Osiander induced George Major, professor of theology and preacher at the castle at Wittenberg, to come forward in strong opposition of the Lutheran doctrine of imputed righteousness, which he, too, condemned as the cause of serious moral degeneration. He defended the thesis that 'good works were necessary to salvation, and that no one could be saved without them.' It was only, he wrote, by the propagation of this teaching that any headway could be made against the 'false and trumped-up creed' now universally accepted, which 'was undermining all obedience both to God and man. The majority of the people nowadays fancy that the law has been abrogated by faith. When they are told

¹ *Erläutertes Preussen*, ii. 69–71; Harlknoch, pp. 353–354.

² Hase, pp. 209–210.

³ Toeppen, *Die Gründung der Universität Königsberg und das Leben des Sabinus*, p. 217.

that through grace we can be justified, and saved by faith alone, without any works of ours, they will no longer listen to a word about any single law, or about good works, but they give themselves up to godless living, by which they dishonour God and His teaching.' 'Our people,' he wrote from long experience, 'are strangers to all preaching on law and good works, and will not put up with it. In these miserable times nobody will hear a word about good works, let preachers define these as they will ; it is perfectly futile, for everybody makes use of the Gospel for carnal liberty and for covering their scandalous deeds. Most men have become shameless epicures ; they believe in no divine retribution, and laugh at all mention of a judgment to come and eternal punishment, and treat these things as fables.'¹

Major's teaching threw both theologians and people into a frantic state of excitement.

Although not one among the divines questioned the general increase of immorality complained of by Major, they nevertheless all of them repudiated with horror his 'ruinous heresy which threatened to bring back all the Popish atrocities.' The Mansfeld theologians declared 'Major's assertion that men were saved by faith, charity, and hope to be a veritable utterance of Anti-christ.'² Even the statement that 'good works, which the Holy Ghost Himself performs in believers, are necessary to the preservation of faith,' was denounced as erroneous doctrine by the strict Lutherans. John Wigand, one of the leading divines, said of it 'that it came from the workshop of the Antichrist. There

¹ Döllinger, *Reformation*, ii. 167–172 and iii. 493 f.

² Schlüsselburg, *Catal. hæret.*, vii. 36.

could be no more abominable sign of the Antichrist in a man than that he should believe and assert that good works were necessary to salvation, even if he only had in his mind the fulfilment of the Ten Commandments. This dogma was the terrible murder-cry of the Roman wolf.' 'The object of such teaching,' Joachim Mörlin assured the people, 'was to drive the whole human race at one fell swoop into the jaws of the devil.'¹ Alexius Prætorius, superintendent in Meissen, tried to show that Major was 'a more cruel and terrible enemy of the Church than the Turks ; yea, that he came straight from the devil.'² Nicholas of Amsdorf, former Lutheran bishop of Naumburg, described Major's assertion as 'the first, the last, the most scandalous, and most mischievous heresy ever known on earth ;'³ he called Major 'a seditious demon,' and in his ardour to strengthen his case against Majorism he went so far as to declare that the statement 'good works are harmful to salvation was a genuine Christian proposition preached by the saints, Paul and Luther.' Flacius Illyricus and John Wigand took this last assertion under their protection. 'If,' wrote the latter, 'we say that good works are harmful, we raise the merits and obedience of Christ to a grandly exalted position ; but if we take up the opposite ground, we belittle the awfulness of sin and the solemnity of the divine judgment.'⁴

Justus Menius, a disciple of Major's and superintendent at Gotha, was attacked with as much violence as his leader. Menius, so Amsdorf declared, 'was wholly possessed by devils, and was more wicked and abominable

¹ Schlüsselburg, *Catal. hæret.*, vii. 68, 168.

² Döllinger, *Reformation*, ii. 166.

³ In the preface of the Jena edition of Luther's *Works* (1555), Bl. 4^a.

⁴ Döllinger, *Reformation*, iii. 810.

than any cut-throat rascal who had abandoned himself wholly to Satan.¹ He said openly—so Menius writes in 1558—that ‘if he were reigning prince he would have Menius’s head cut off.’² ‘In the churches there was an infernal hubbub,’ for Major and Menius paid back their revilers in the same coin. Menius warned all pious ‘Christians’ against Flacius, who belonged to the category of ‘unclean swine, hungering after filth;’ he adjured them to supplicate God, that He would ‘drive such filthy sows, which so scandalously defiled His sanctuary, out of His temple into a pigsty or a cloaca, which was their proper place.’³ Major retaliated by calling Amsdorf, Flacius, and all their associates ‘Mamelukes, liars, murderers, and companions of the devil.’⁴ When he heard that the theologians of Jena and Bruns-

¹ Walch, *Einleitung*, v. 347.

² *Bericht der bittern Wahrheit* (Wittenberg, 1558), O¹.

³ Schmidt, *Justus Menius*, ii. 259, note. The following whole passage from the *Verantwortung Justi Menij*, D², will serve as an illustration of the polemics of the day: ‘The calumniator Illyricus and all his crew fumble and grope up and down in this book, sniff about through all the articles, in the hopes of finding some stinking stuff which they can stir up with their disgusting pig snouts, so that the stench of it shall spread through the whole world, and every one be obliged to stop up his nostrils. But whereas these unclean, filth-hunting swine can find nothing, they poke in and rub in their own dirt—that is to say, they have the impudence to deface and disfigure and interlard what is well and truly written with their venomous, perverse interpretations and calumnies, and to twist it all into a false and evil meaning; but they cannot do it openly and with a good conscience, must rather have a care that they do not bring on themselves more dishonour than honour; so they cackle and gloat together over their lies and calumnies, and one unclean sow fondly rubs the snout of another. In order, however, that their Cainish brotherly love should not be left to lie idle, they exercise it upon secret schemes of assassination, in the hopes (from which may the good Almighty God graciously hinder them) of living to see the death of the Lord Philip, when they will be able to go on all the more freely and gaily with their lying, slandering, and calumniating, yea, even to their hearts’ content.’

⁴ Walch, *Einleitung*, v. 347.

wick had demanded a public condemnation of his doctrine, he exclaimed from the pulpit at Wittenberg : ' I will go on anathematising them until they mend their ways. I will remain Magnus, Major, and Maximus against them all, even at the risk of forfeiting my life.'¹

While the theologians, both in their writings and from the pulpit, were ' letting fly at each other in such a manner that there could be no other result than hatred, quarrelling, and wretchedness among the people,'² each laid on the other the blame of the general disturbed state of affairs.

One of the leading assailants of Osianderites, Majorites, ' and all other devilish rabble that digressed from Luther's pure doctrine,' was Tilman Hesshus of Wesel on the Lower Rhine. He belonged to the number of those militant theologians who in every word, thought, and action of Luther, their ' holy father,' recognised ' the all-illumining strength and majesty ' of God; who claimed canonical authority for Luther's writings, and who were cheered and encouraged by the hope that ' after a well-fought fight they would see Dr. Martin up in heaven, seated among the Apostles, judging the twelve tribes of Israel and the impious Papacy with all its rabble.' According to Hesshus, whatever deviated from Luther's doctrine was at variance with the teaching of the Holy Ghost. On his promotion to the rank of Doctor at Wittenberg, in the year 1555, he entered a vehement protest against the devil and all the devil's officials—heretics, Papists,

¹ Salig, iii. 324.

² *Christliche Klage des einfältigen Volkes* (1559), C².

pagans, and Mohammedans ; and later on he confessed openly that he had sinned grievously in receiving his doctor's title from 'that plague spot among theologians,' George Major.

As superintendent at Goslar, Hesshus came into violent collision with the town council for having, without the consent of that body, formulated a new code of Church regulations. The conditions of the town as regards religion, morality, and government were deplorable. Crime went altogether unpunished. The son of the chief burgomaster had deserted his wife. His father had not inflicted any penalty on him, and his uncle, for daring to reproach him, was stabbed by the offender at a supper party. The second burgomaster was in the habit of retaining Church revenues. Hesshus spoke from the pulpit in condemnation of this dishonest conduct, and was consequently banished from the town in the year 1556.¹ He went to Rostock, where he was appointed professor of theology and preacher at the church of St. James.

At Rostock also dissensions promptly began, and 'for many years to come the Christian life of the community was in a state of complete upset.' The history of these religious disturbances is of wide significance as exemplifying the manner in which the struggles for 'true doctrine and Church government' were frequently carried on in Protestant towns.

Some years before, the town council of Rostock, on the plea of 'not being able to cope with the populace in the matter of religion,' had brought about a forcible disruption of the local church, and taken possession of the

¹ Wilkens, pp. 6 ff. 25-28; Helmolt, pp. 16-25.

ecclesiastical property.¹ The council wanted to be independent of all clerical influence. Hesshus, on the other hand, and his colleague at St. James's, Peter Eggerdes, claimed 'the full power of the keys' with regard to exclusion from the Eucharist, from sponsorship, and from Christian burial. They opposed the celebration of marriages on Sunday, saying that weddings were a desecration of the holy day. When Peter Brümmer, one of the burgomasters, gave it as his opinion that 'these same preachers wanted to start a new Pharisaical sect,' Hesshus, according to his own narrative, thundered out from the pulpit, before all the congregation, that the burgomaster was 'a lying, disreputable, blasphemous man, a child of the devil, and an enemy of the Holy Ghost, and that if he did not repent of his blasphemy he would have to suffer the torments of everlasting hell-fire.' 'In like manner,' so the narrative goes on, 'did my colleague, Peter Eggerdes, denounce the blasphemer in the parish, using almost the identical words, but adding further that Peter Brümmer was not only a godless liar but also a perjured violator of oaths, for by his blasphemy he had broken the oath which he had made to Almighty God at his baptism.'

In consequence of these diatribes the town council deposed the preachers and ordered them to leave the town, and on their refusing to do so and appealing to Duke Ulrich of Mecklenburg, he caused them to be expelled by force. 'On Sunday, October 9, 1557,' writes Hesshus, 'the council despatched a band of thirty men, servants and burghers, armed with muskets, poles, and

¹ Fuller details in Lisch, *Jahrbücher*, xvi. 10 ff., concerning the dissension among the preachers which arose immediately on the introduction of the new doctrine in 1531; cf. *Jahrbücher*, xxiv. 140–155.

spears, like the Jews who fell upon the Lord Christ in the garden ; and they came in the dead of the night and attacked my friend and his fellow-helper, Herr Peter, in his house with great tumult and bellowing, and broke the door open with poles ; and when the honourable and virtuous lady, the wife of the preacher, who through God's blessing was pregnant, became greatly terrified and screamed piteously, the ruffianly scoundrels, taking no heed of her condition, threatened her with hard words ; and one of them held his spear at her breast and also dragged the man out of the house, and led him three miles away from the town. Then, because I saw that they were quite mad and beside themselves, and possessed by the devil that ruled the council, I took away my wife and my little child, and also Mein Herr Peter's wife. This is how they behaved at Rostock, and the like has not been heard of in the towns where the Gospel is proclaimed since the time when Luther began to preach.'

On October 17, 1557, the members of the council issued an edict in which they endeavoured to justify the expulsion of the two preachers, charged these men, as well as the collective body of town preachers, with spreading false doctrine and fomenting riots, and at the same time commanded all the citizens to avoid their company and their sermons. The preachers themselves were enjoined to read this document from their pulpits. Among other things it stated that 'some of the preachers presume to speak from the pulpit as if the town council had acted unjustly, and they have the insolence to wish that the town may be blasted by hell-fire, thunder, and lightning ; they anathematise and curse, jump and bang about in the pulpit like madmen ;

they torture and strangle consciences, condemn men's bodies to the gallows and their souls to the devil.'

In answer to these accusations Hesshus published a pamphlet, in his own and Eggerdes' name, in which he reproached the council with all manner of shameful deeds, and accused it of allowing itself the liberty 'of shameless lying and cursing, of murder and profligacy, and all the other works of the devil.' Joachim Schlüter, he said, who was the first preacher of the 'Gospel' at Rostock, had been poisoned by the council. The preacher Henry Schmedenstedt had been betrayed and sold by 'the accursed, bloodthirsty burgomasters.' 'You were rather milder that time than Annas and Caiaphas; for I have been informed that the blood of this righteous man brought you in five hundred florins. It is verily a shame that the servant should have been valued more highly than his Lord and God.' The preacher Adeler also had suffered daily 'torture and martyrdom at their hands.' In short, they had persistently shown themselves 'murderous, bloodthirsty hounds, and enemies of God.' Finally, Doctor Johannes Draconites, the present superintendent appointed by the town council, was 'a jackass and an unmannerly blockhead, a desperate and damnable preacher of lies.'

Draconites, immediately on assuming office, had got into hot water with several preachers, and the quarrel had waxed fiercer year by year. He had preached in favour of Sunday weddings, and had declared that Christians must never have the law held over their heads. 'Whoever preaches the law to Christians,' he had said, 'commits an offence against God in heaven. Away with you, Moses; away with you! Whosoever calls others sinners according to the law, himself sins

doubly.' ‘Off to the devil with the Sabbatarians,’ he exclaimed against the other town preachers, ‘who teach that we need only to be pious on Sunday and that we may live like beasts all the rest of the week !’ For all these offences they called the superintendent a wicked hypocrite, a hellish dragon, a shameless scoundrel. They fell foul of him also on account of another dogma which he had taken up from the Hamburg superintendent, John Aepinus—namely, that ‘the soul of Christ, after His death, had suffered pain and martyrdom in hell, and that every Christian was bound to believe this at the risk of losing his salvation.’ The town and the university split up into two hostile parties, and on one occasion matters came almost to a hand-to-hand fight in the church. Peace was not restored even when Dracconites was deposed from his office and left the town.

The burgomaster Brümmer had already been removed from the council in 1558, and no preacher would administer the Sacrament to him; for he was ‘an impenitent blasphemer’ because he had asserted that Eggerdes and Hesshus had wanted to establish a new Pharisaic sect, and had further been the chief instigators of the banishment of these two witnesses of God and of the mandate issued by the council. There was moreover another way in which Brümmer had been guilty of blasphemy. In spite of the injunction of the preachers that the Catholics remaining in Rostock were to be treated as ‘blasphemous Papists,’ and as such excluded from the privileges of sponsorship and Christian burial, Brümmer had once ‘strictly charged the schoolmasters and clerks’ at the funeral of a Catholic canon to ‘observe all the usual ceremonies with which it was customary to honour pious Christians.’ He had

even himself ‘taken the lead in following the coffin of this godless blasphemer.’ Hesshus considered that the burgomaster deserved stoning for this proceeding. ‘If thieves and murderers,’ he said in a pamphlet against the edict of the town council, ‘are considered infamous because they are destitute of righteousness, how much more should a blasphemer of God be reckoned an infamous scoundrel, for he is not only without righteousness himself, but is the declared enemy of the fountain of all righteousness. For is any act of theft, murder, or incest so monstrous and abominable, even were it the strangling of a father by a son, as is blasphemy? How, then, is it possible that such a one as Brügger should any longer command our respect? Remember what sort of sentence Moses pronounces on blasphemers of this sort. He not only declares them to be rogues, but also condemns them to death and to the flaying-place, and says that God had commanded them to be stoned; and in fulfilment of this sentence an Egyptian who had blasphemed the name of God in the same way that Brügger has done, was led outside the camp and stoned by the children of Israel.¹

Contests of the same violent description as at Rostock went on in nearly all the Protestant towns, and everywhere the populace was stirred up to hatred, for the pulpit was used by each preacher in turn to push forward his own particular doctrines (with imprecations on his opponents) as the only one that could lead to salvation. The town of Stargard, for instance, after the year 1556, was ‘in a constant state of anarchy owing to

¹ See this and other more detailed accounts of the Rostock Church quarrels in the treatise of J. Wiggers entitled ‘Tilmann Heshusius und Johann Draconites,’ in Lisch, *Jahrbücher*, xix. 65–137.

the dissensions among its preachers, the disorder of its schools, and the insubordination of the people ; ' so miserable a state of anarchy that it could not be sufficiently deplored, nor is it possible to describe it.'¹ At a provincial diet at Stettin it was brought to the notice of the members that ' by all sorts of deeds of violence and unbecoming procedure the pastors were insulted in church and even in the pulpit, and that this was done everywhere with impunity.'² At Hildesheim, in the year 1557, the preachers quarrelled with their superintendent, Tilmann Cragius, over the doctrines of justification and of the Eucharist. Cragius opposed as an undoubted superstition the regulation of the preachers that ' if, when a man was receiving the Sacrament, any of the wine remained clinging to his beard, he ought to tear out his beard.' The preachers further complained that, ' because they had treated the bread in the Holy Sacrament with especial reverence,' the superintendent had publicly insulted them and called them opprobrious names, ending with the blasphemous remark : ' Go to, then ; devour it, lick it, munch it, and worship it.' Cragius was hunted out of the town, and he vented his feelings in a pamphlet in which he denounced the whole body of preachers as ' scoundrels and blasphemers, scandalmongers, mad dogs, and brutish Cainites.'³

It was at the religious conference of Worms, and in the presence of the supreme imperial authority, that the division in the Protestant camp first came under the cognisance of the Empire at large.

¹ Cramer, iii, 135-136.

² *Ibid.* iii. 145.

³ Salig, iii. 411-413. For the quarrels of preachers in Schweinfurt, see Sixt, *Schweinfurt*, pp. 182-183.

CHAPTER II

THE RELIGIOUS CONFERENCE AT WORMS IN 1557

At the time of the conclusion of the Religious Peace it had been agreed that ways and means of settling the religious disputes should be discussed at another imperial assembly. King Ferdinand had summoned a Diet at Ratisbon for this purpose, and also with a view to obtaining a Turkish subsidy. It had been opened on July 13, 1556, and had proved ‘just as discordant as all former ones.’ The ecclesiastical Estates had declared emphatically that the existing schism could only be healed by means of a general council. But the Protestants, although pre-determined not to make ‘the slightest concession to the Papacy, which was cursed in the Word of God,’ were in favour of holding another religious conference, in the hopes that thereby ‘some injury might accrue to the Antichrist.’ ‘Former conferences,’ insisted the Palatine Elector, ‘have not been without fruit; for through them the knowledge of the Word of God has been extended.’¹ Melanchthon, too, hoped, by means of a conference, that ‘some of the princes and bishops might be brought round to the true doctrine.’ One point, however, must, it was said, be settled beforehand among the Protestants. ‘The Emperor, the King, and many others,’ he wrote, ‘feel very

¹ *Bucholtz*, vii. 361.

strongly about the article concerning the ordination of priests ; for they stick to the opinion that our priests who are not ordained by bishops have no power to consecrate. Now this motive brings much error in its train, and, therefore, if this conference is to take place, we must first of all discuss among ourselves the questions of ordination and episcopal jurisdiction.¹

Each of the former religious conferences had only served to increase general bewilderment and dissension.

‘The experience of centuries,’ urged the Jesuit Father Peter Canisius, who had accompanied the Cardinal-bishop Otto von Augsburg to the Diet, ‘gives ample proof that at such meetings time is only frittered away with profitless talk. At the end, neither party will ever allow itself to have been beaten ; each side claims the victory ; contradictory reports of the transactions are spread about, and the result is not tranquillisation of minds and temper, but only worse division and embitterment.’² Ferdinand was nevertheless of opinion that, for the present, a colloquy would be the most efficient means, and on pressure from him the ecclesiastical Estates withdrew their opposition. They agreed that the conclusions of the conference should be unprejudiced, ‘the debates conducted with meekness, mutual confidence, and earnest zeal, and that their reports should be brought before the next imperial assembly for further consideration.’ It was insisted on as imperative that the Protestant theologians ‘should renounce the errors and digressions which had crept into their teaching, and should become reconciled with each

¹ *Corp. Reform.* ix. 6, 7. Wolf, *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Protestanten*, p. 21 f.

² Riess, p. 195.

other in a Christian manner.'¹ The conference was to begin at Worms on August 24, 1557.

At the suggestion of the Palatine Elector and the Duke of Würtemberg, several of the Protestant princes assembled at Frankfort-on-the-Main, in June 1557, in order to make the necessary preliminary arrangements, and to smooth down existing differences as much as possible. At this gathering the Landgrave Philip of Hesse moved a resolution for reform of the Augsburg Confession, saying that there was no obligation to conform unconditionally to this creed, for 'it had not been accepted as absolutely certain, but only proposed for the better instruction of the confessionists.'² This proposal met with no approval ; neither did another resolution brought forward by the Ratisbon divine, Nicholas Gallus, who moved that a superintendent-general should be set over all the Lutheran churches of Germany, with plenary power to guard the interests of orthodoxy and religious unity, to rebuke and prevent digressions from the faith, to institute legal examination in cases of dissension, and to make the necessary arrangements for securing final decisions. Gallus himself had not been very keen about placing a 'Pope' over the collective body of Lutheran churches, and he therefore made no objection to an amendment on his resolution to the effect that the general superintendence should be divided between two plenipotentiaries, one of whom should have charge of the South German and the other of the Saxon

¹ Letter of Duke John Frederic of Saxony, in the *Corp. Reform.* ix. 230. See Kutzler, ii. 55. Manche, one of the Protestant members, believed that Ferdinand had only consented to the conference 'ut vextigal hoc prætextu ex Germania maximum colligeret.' Bullinger to Calvin, August 20, 1557. *Calvini Opp.* xvi. 572.

Heppe, *Geschichte des deutschen Protestantismus*, i. 151.

churches.¹ The amended resolution, however, was also rejected. The result of the conference was to bind the preachers afresh to the Augsburg Confession and the apology. If the adversaries, it was decreed, should reproach the Evangelicals at Worms with being divided among themselves, they were to answer that in the main and on the leading points of doctrine they were agreed. All outstanding differences were to be settled at a later synod, and meanwhile the theologians who were at strife together were not to publish any writings independently of the censorship of the Estates or their delegates.²

This Frankfort Recess gave rise to a new controversy.

Gallus declared that ‘the Estates would be the laughing-stock of the whole world, if they attempted to persuade people that nothing had been taught or done in contradiction to the Augsburg Confession in any of the churches or schools in their country since the year 1530.’ Flacius Illyricus called the Frankfort Recess ‘a betrayal of the Church.’³ There was no judgment recorded in it against the Sacramentarians, whom Luther and all pious teachers had persistently condemned, neither had it bound the theologians over to the Smalcald articles, which omission was a cruel wound inflicted on the Church. The vaunted unity of doctrine did certainly not exist in reality. Senseless Sacramentarians and other sectarians, it was said, must have been the spokesmen at Frankfort, for they were now trying to

¹ Salig, iii. 266, 267. See Menzel, ii. 314, 315.

² Salig, iii. 271–273. Preger, ii. 63, 64. For an account of the Assembly of Princes at Frankfort, see Wolf, *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Protestantenten*, p. 68 ff.

³ *Corp. Reform.* ix. 213–215.

stop the mouths of the honest and zealous men who so far had opposed the inroad of the wolves.

Flacius and the whole party of strict Lutherans found a staunch supporter in Duke John Frederic II. of Saxe-Weimar, who declared that he would 'live and die for the maintenance and propagation of the pure evangel revealed by God to the dear Father Luther.' For this object he had founded a university at Jena, which had become a stronghold 'of genuine Lutheranism,' and which combated with holy zeal 'that base apostate from the true faith, the heretical and anti-christian Melanchthon, together with the whole pestilential crew of the Wittenberg University.' On the basis of a memorandum presented him by Flacius, John Frederic instructed his divines and delegates at the Worms conference to have no intercourse with the divines and delegates of the other Protestant Estates, so long as these refused to denounce emphatically all the various sects and gangs of Anabaptists, Sacramentarians, Zwinglians, Osianderites, Majorites, and others. How would it be possible, wrote the Duke to the Count Palatine Wolfgang of Zweibrücken, for the theologians to oppose a united front to the Papists, and to speak against them with one voice, unless they became reconciled to each other, and renounced their respective errors? The Papists would otherwise be easily in a position to slay them with their own weapons.¹ The Duke informed the Palatine Elector, Otto Heinrich, that he would help to destroy all erroneous doctrines at Worms.² Flacius told Erhard Schnepf and Joachim Mörlin, delegates to the conference, that no more Judas kisses must be tolerated at Worms; that the doctrine, taught in

¹ *Corp. Reform.* ix. 230-232.

² Kugler, ii. 56.

some writings, of renewal and vivification through the Holy Ghost was nothing less than a pillar of Majorism. Melanchthon must be closely pressed ; he was delaying to recant his errors because he feared public shame and the displeasure of courts, and moreover was constrained to obey his tutor.¹ By his *tutor* Flacius meant the devil.

Melanchthon, on his part, wrote to Prince Joachim of Anhalt : ‘ The venomous teaching and the hypocrisy of Flacius become daily better known, and if the conference at Worms really takes place there will be some talk on this subject among all the electors, princes, and town delegates who will then be gathered together. He has not explained a single tenet of his faith ; he is only on the look-out for calumny and slander, and he helps to strengthen hypocrisy and error.’²

With all these conflicting opinions it was hard work even to get the conference started by September 11.

In the opening session Melanchthon opposed the Catholics in impassioned language. ‘ From the Confession of Faith drawn up at Augsburg in the year 1530,’ he said, ‘ we never have deviated, and we never shall deviate ; we repudiate all opinions and sects which are at variance with this creed, above all the godless decisions of the so-called synod of Trent ; we believe that the true Church is not made up of persons who wilfully resist the truth, but that it is found in the assembly of those who proclaim the unadulterated, unfalsified word of the Gospel, and who do not unwittingly defend idolatry.’³ In a letter to the Margrave Hans von Cüstrin the year before, he had already declared that ‘ for the great

¹ *Corp. Reform.* ix. 232-234.

² *Ibid.* ix. 116.

³ *Ibid.* ix. 265-268. Bucholtz, vii. 371, 372. Reiss, p. 213.

kings of the earth, according to the fashion nowadays, to dignify with the name of “Council” the Pope and his bishops, priests, and monks, who are public enemies of Christ and the Gospel, and to have full power to make new articles of faith and new gods, is downright blasphemy such as Nebuchadnezzar and Antiochus were guilty of. “The Popish blasphemy” could easily be appreciated by every intelligent person.’ The Jesuit Peter Canisius, one of the Catholic collocutors at Worms, he called a cynic, and he classed him among his ‘learned persecutors who against their own consciences pursued recognised truth with malicious sophistry, and strengthened the cause of error and idolatry,’ and ‘for this behaviour of theirs would receive the reward of Judas.’¹

While it was thus settled in advance that the Catholics, in defending the Catholic cause, were intentional persecutors of recognised truth, that the Catholic dogmas established at the Council of Trent were impious and blasphemous, and that at no price whatever would the Protestants budge a hair’s breadth from the Augsburg Confession, there could be no question of reconciliation of any sort with the Catholics, even had Melanchthon not gone to the length of his flagrantly false assertion that there had never been any digression from this creed—an assertion once flatly contradicted by the pronouncement of thirty-four Lutheran divines, who all declared that this Confession had undergone so many changes since 1530 that the various editions were as different from each other as were a *cothurnus* (a laced peasant’s boot), *Bundschuh* (a slipper), and a Polish boot; indeed, the creed might now be compared to a

¹ *Corp. Reform.* viii. 688-689.

large and roomy cloak under whose ample folds the Sacramentarians and all the other sects might hide, dissemble, defend, and justify their errors and falsehoods.¹

Melanchthon had regarded this Confession, which he had drawn up himself, as his own property, and, whenever it had passed through a new edition, had altered it in accordance with the changes in his own opinions. Even the earliest editions differed from each other in one essential point,² and the difference between these and the later ones was incomparably greater.

The Protestant princes themselves were by no means ignorant of this. ‘From the year 1531 to 1540,’ we read in a letter to Duke Julius of Brunswick, ‘the copies can be proved to have been altered nearly every year, and in the edition of 1540 some points have been changed and twisted in an almost dangerous manner.’ This was especially the case, the letter goes on to say, in the tenth article on the Eucharist; in the article concerning the office of preacher also; and in the different editions of the apology alterations had been made, and in the article on ‘the authority of the Church’ whole pages had been inserted. ‘These facts, alas, are only too well known to the Papists, and both they and the Emperor have brought them reproachfully to the notice of the Protestants, and they cannot be denied by us.’³

Owing to the alteration alluded to in the doctrine of the Eucharist, even the avowed or secret adherents of Calvinism could subscribe to the Confession; they could

¹ Hutter, p. 94^a.

² Of this more later on in the section entitled ‘The Diet of Princes at Naumburg, 1561.’

³ In Hutter, p. 162.

appeal to it with clear consciences ; it presented no stumbling-blocks to them.¹

Already at the Augsburg Diet of 1555, when the transactions relating to peace between the Catholics and the Augsburg confessionists had first begun, the Elector of Treves had asked which version of the creed was meant—that of 1530 or that of 1540 ? The Brandenburg delegate had then answered unhesitatingly that ‘ his Elector recognised only the Confession of 1530.’ The delegate of the Elector Palatine had said that the peace in question related to the adherents of the Confession ‘ as it stood in 1530 with any later additions that harmonised with its general drift.’ The delegate of the Elector of Saxony said ‘ his Elector also recognised no other edition than of 1530.’ At the same time, however, he tried to make it seem ‘ as if the later editions coincided with this one.’² And yet, no later than 1541, the Elector John Frederic, through his chancellor, Brück, had had occasion to reproach Melanchthon for having presumed, without the knowledge and consent of the Elector and the other Protestant Estates, to alter

¹ This alteration was a very important one, for not only were the words ‘et improbat secus docentes’ omitted, but also the sentence ‘De cœna Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis vere adsint et distribuantur vescientibus’ was changed into ‘quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi vescientibus.’ See Kiesling, p. 15 ff. ‘The change in the phrase *adsint et distribuantur* into *exhibeantur* is evidently intended,’ said Sudhoff (p. 68), ‘to make the participation in the body of Christ independent of the elements of bread and wine, and to weaken down the actual partaking of all present at the altar into a mere presentation to all. The addition *cum pane* forms also an important digression from the original wording. For, because the unaltered Confession represents the body and blood as present *under bread and wine*, and therefore present *in the bread*, Melanchthon, now plainly inclining to the reformed views and aiming at reunion, added the correction *cum pane*, with the bread.’

² Ritter, Augsburg, *Religionsfriede*, pp. 226, 227.

the Confession in many points, and have it printed in its altered form.¹

At the Worms conference Canisius, in his capacity of Catholic collocutor, pointed out ‘that the “Augustana” varied in many respects, and that very material alterations had been made in the most important of the articles,’² and this led the rest of the Catholic collocutors to require of the Protestants that, since they were perpetually appealing to the Augsburg Confession, they would state more particularly which of the sects they did not recognise and considered excluded from their community by the articles of the Confession. All the different sects, said the Catholic collocutors, the Bohemian Brothers, the Osianderites, the Majorites, and so forth, reckon themselves among the Augsburg confessionists. But if they all really profess the same creed, why do they write so bitterly against each other? and why should not we, on the strength of the Ratisbon Recess, demand of the Protestants that they should first settle among themselves which of their number have remained true to the Augsburg Confession?³

The Saxon and Brunswick divines pronounced this demand of the Catholics just and reasonable, and they handed in to the president of the conference, Julius Pflug, Bishop of Naumburg, a written statement to the effect that the Würtemberg theologian, Brenz, was refusing to condemn the Sacramentarians in order to

¹ Löscher, ii. 46.

² Salig, iii. 308; Heppe, *Gesch. des deutschen Protestantismus*, i. 187.

³ ‘Declaratio uberior super protestatione partis Catholice,’ in Salig, iii. 327. For the religious conference of Worms, see now Wolf, *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Protestanten*, 81 f., 90 f., 101 f., 106 f. For an account of Helling’s exhaustive labours at this conference, see Paulus in the *Katholik*, 1894, ii. 490 f.

please Melanchthon, and that Melanchthon in return had spared Osiander. ‘Thus our two leaders,’ they said, ‘are playing into each other’s hands, and truth and the Church are going to the ground. God have pity on us !’¹

The mutual hatred and bitterness of the Protestant theologians increased from day to day. ‘Whichever way we turn,’ wrote the Saxon delegates to John Frederic, ‘we find love and charity extinguished, and we meet with nothing but sneering faces and talk, division, and hypocrisy.’² Erasmus Sarcerius declared that it was a well-known fact that ‘Brenz and others had received bribes and presents to encourage and defend Osianderism.’³ Brenz, on the other hand, complained bitterly of the discord introduced by the Saxon theologians, and of what he called ‘the paroxysm of anathematising.’⁴ Melanchthon wrote to John Frederic on October 1: ‘Your princely Grace’s delegate, Dr. Basilius, put lying papers into the hands of the Palatine and Wittenberg delegates before my arrival.’⁵

‘If you want to be convinced,’ wrote Flacius to the King of Denmark, ‘of the utter state of confusion to which religious doctrine has come, you have only to

¹ *Saxoniconum Ducalium Epist. ad præsidem*, of October 1, 1557, in Salig, iii. 314, note.

² Planck, vi. 134, note; Heppe, i. 162, note. See the letter of Erhard Schnepf in the *Corp. Reform.* ix. 255.

³ Planck, vi. 141.

⁴ See the letters of Brenz to the Dukes Albert of Prussia and Christopher of Wirtemberg, in Pressel, *Anecdota*, pp. 440-443. The Margrave George Frederic of Anspach propounded to the theologians the question whether (as the Anspach Superintendent George Karge asserted) the body of Christ in the Holy Eucharist passed into the stomach, was digested like other food, and also thrown off in the course of nature. Salig, iii. 303; *Corp. Reform.* ix. 275-278; Mönckeberg, p. 107.

⁵ Schumacher, iii. 393.

glance at the Worms conference. There you will find almost as many different opinions as there are Protestants gathered together.'¹ James Andreä, of Tübingen, relates of the conference at Worms : 'At an assembly of Protestant theologians Brenz had reminded the meeting of the Wittenberg Concord transactions of the year 1536, saying "it was Melanchthon himself who had drawn up the formula of Concord." On Melanchthon's replying that he had only written down the opinions of others, Matthäus Alber interposed : "Mr. Preceptor, you nevertheless signed it yourself." Whereupon Melanchthon retorted : "Dear Matthäus, I have written a great deal that I no longer agree to. Do you suppose I have not advanced at all in thirty years ?"'²

Canisius wrote to Lainez, vicar-general of the order of Jesuits, in September 1557 : 'The Protestants are all at sixes and sevens ; Melanchthon complains in despair : "All of you are setting upon me alone." He has more injustice and contradiction to put up with from his own party, from those who have hitherto been his disciples, than from our side. "All eyes in Germany are turned to the conference with the utmost expectation."³

Melanchthon could give satisfaction to no one. While the Lutheran divines accused him of Calvinistic tendencies, Calvin complained of his 'detestable and

¹ 'Ibi quot ferme colloquuntur Augustanae Confessionis sunt, tot etiam diversæ sententiae.' Schumacher, ii. 276; *Corp. Reform.* ix. 297; Pontoppidan, iii. 354.

² Hartmann, *M. Alber*, p. 165.

³ From Worms, dated September 11 and 29, 1557. A great many unprinted letters and statements of Canisius and others addressed to Jesuits, and documents relating to the latter were placed at my disposal by the Jesuit Fathers at Exaeten in Holland, where they are busy with the publication of MSS. left by Canisius. Meanwhile P. Braunsberger has brought out the first volume of the *Epistulæ Canisii* in a most exemplary manner. This volume comes down to July 1556.

dangerous pliability' at Worms. 'He went even further than I suspected,' wrote Calvin.¹

As if to make a diversion from their own dissensions and reciprocal acrimony, the Protestant theologians at Worms began preaching seditious sermons against the Catholics.² They even attempted to raise tumultuous scenes in the churches during the performance of Catholic worship. Salig, in his history of the Augsburg Confession, gives the following narrative: 'After the Bavarian court preacher, John Gressenicus, had been discoursing on St. Andrew's day in the church of St. Andrew's, Dr. Marbach seized hold of him as he came from the pulpit, accused him of blaspheming God, and began disputing with him in church before all the congregation. But a stand was made by the people, and the evangelicals themselves showed disapproval of Marbach's behaviour. James Andreä treated John a Via, the cathedral preacher, in the same manner, and challenged him, as he was leaving the pulpit, to make a public defence of his sermon. But the preacher answered that he would make his defence at home and not in the church.'³

Among the Protestant collocutors 'the most terrible fighting and quarrelling, such as had never been heard of before, was kept up.'⁴

On account of their dogged insistence on the 'condemnation of the false sects' the Saxon and the Bruns-

¹ *Calvini Opp.* pp. 17, 61.

² 'The justice of the complaints raised by the Catholics concerning the seditious sermons preached by evangelical theologians at Worms cannot by any means be called in question.' So writes Heppe in his *Geschichte des deutschen Protestantismus*, i. 228, note. See Beil, p. 60.

³ Salig, iii. 340.

⁴ Report of the Court preacher Aurifaber in the *Corp. Reform.* ix. 307.

wick divines were excluded from taking part in the proceedings. Thus it became impossible to continue the conference, for the Catholics naturally asked to be informed which of the parties were really considered traitors of the Protestant cause, and with which of them they were to continue negotiations.¹ ‘After the last diet,’ they said, ‘they had been enjoined to confer only with the theologians who subscribed to the Augsburg Confession; now, however, they could no longer tell who these were, as they one and all accused each other of apostasy from this creed.’

The Saxon theologians took their departure, and the conference broke up. By speech and by pen the Protestants blamed the Catholics for the failure of the attempt at unification; but the tone of their writings was in itself sufficient evidence against themselves.²

If the Protestants had hoped that this conference would serve to injure the Papacy, their expectation was disappointed. The Catholics at Worms had shown themselves firm and united, whereas it had become abundantly evident that the other side had no solid objective principle of doctrine, and also that the new symbol of the Augsburg Confession afforded them no centre of unity. At the Ratisbon Diet King Ferdinand

¹ Heppe, i. 198.

² ‘We cannot help noticing the fact’ (says Planck, vi. 169, note 193), ‘that in the many controversial pamphlets issued by both parties after the conference, as to which bore the greater share of responsibility for its breaking up, the Catholics had a great advantage over the Protestants, and that they knew how to make the best of it. This appears most markedly in the writings published as early as 1558 by John a Via, court preacher at Worms; by Bartholomew Latimer, one of the Treves delegates at the conference; and especially by the famous Frederic Staphylus, who also had played a leading part in the conference. The same fact, however, is sufficiently brought out by the quite unwarranted bitterness of the Protestant replies, even of Melanchthon’s.’

and the secular Catholic Estates had still differed in opinion from the spiritual Estates, and when it had come to the question of a council or a conference, in deference to the wishes of the Protestants, they had voted for the latter. Not till the conference was over did it become evident to them that no attempt at union would have any satisfactory results unless it was conducted in the regular ecclesiastical manner. The Catholics,' wrote Canisius to Lainez, 'have been strengthened in their faith ; vacillating souls are restrained from apostasy, and erring ones are more easily recovered. The imperial Estates will see from the proceedings of the conference that union with the Protestants is not to be achieved in this manner, and perhaps the princes will henceforth renounce all idea of religious discussions and agree to the only efficient method—a general council.'¹

For the Protestants, whose want of unity had now come openly to light, the conference led to still greater mutual acrimony. Duke John Frederic of Saxony threw the blame of 'all the discord and tumult' on the Würtemberg theologians, Brenz and Andreä, who had been determined not to let the Osianderites be suppressed.² The strict Lutherans were ready to wreak vengeance on the Melanchthonians as the cause of all their humiliating dismissal. 'Our party has been discomfited, disjointed, proscribed, and damned in the eyes of the saintly Pharisees,' wrote John Aurifaber, Court preacher at Weimar, 'but you will soon see, we shall

¹ From Worms, dated December 6, 1557. See above, p. 40, note 3. For an account of the Worms conference and its results, see Maurenbrecher, pp. 40–46; also Ritter, i. 136 f.

² Kugler, ii. 62.

dare publish the dirty tales and proclaim our guilt openly before the world.'¹

Flacius Illyricus, at the beginning of the year 1558, appealed to Christian III. of Denmark to follow the example of Josias, and 'set to work in good earnest to do all in his power' towards rooting out from God's Church the abominable and most mischievous errors of the Melanchthonians, the Osianderites, the Majorites, and other sects, which were leading innumerable souls straight to hell.' Their errors, he said, were monstrous whoredoms with the Babylonish Beast. All hands must join together 'to preserve the holy legacy of Christ, of Paul, and of Luther, the third Elias.' 'We have a solemn command,' said Flacius, 'to flee from idolatry and false prophets. But how can we do this if we are not allowed to judge all teaching and all teachers ?'²

Luther had set more store by Flacius than by all other theologians. It was on him, he had said, that after his own death 'prostrate hope would lean.'³ And now Flacius was being denounced at Wittenberg as 'the scum and filth of humanity.'

'Go and tame the frenzy and raging of this fellow,' Bugenhagen once exclaimed from the pulpit, 'that he may cease his lying and blaspheming.' Diaconus Sturio also inveighed against Flacius in his sermons as a liar, a rogue, and a scoundrel.⁴ George Major said of him that he had formerly wheedled himself into Melanchthon's good graces by all sorts of wiles and hypocrisy and Pharisaic humility, and then, with villainous perfidy, he had treasured up every syllable, speech, and letter, every mere dream even of his patron, in order

¹ Salig, iii. 339. ² *Apology*, preface and leaf D². ³ Preger, i. 35.

⁴ Heppe, *Gesch. des deutschen Protestantismus*, i. 129, note 1.

by their means to bring general odium on their author and all his friends, so that, having accomplished Melanchthon's downfall, he himself might be honoured and worshipped throughout Germany as the Pope of the Protestant Church. Flacius was even accused of having broken open Melanchthon's coffers and stolen his letters, and also of having attempted his life and those of others. The 'Letters of Wittenberg Students,' which appeared in 1558, represented Flacius as the quintessence of ignorance and rascality. 'What, after all, does it lead to,' asks Flacius, 'when one theologian thus shamelessly and falsely blackens and defames another by the narration of his private history?' The Church of God, he said, was not greatly concerned to know if he really was the wicked scoundrel they made him out. What she chiefly set store by was whether or no he taught true and sound doctrine.¹ 'It is an undoubted fact,' wrote Justus Jonas the younger, professor of jurisprudence at Wittenberg, to Duke Albert of Prussia, in 1558, 'that Amsdorf and Illyricus have but one aim and object in all their writings—viz. to keep on their side the common people and the poor ignorant laity, who form the great bulk of the nation, and to whose ranks also belongs a large number of preachers and others who are only learned in their own estimation.' 'I know that among thousands of preachers, in Saxony especially, not one really understands the doctrine of the Sacrament.'²

¹ Preger, i. 421-434.

² Voigt, *Correspondence with Albert of Prussia*, pp. 355-356, 364.

CHAPTER III

THE FRANKFORT RECESS OF 1558 AND THE BOOK
OF REFUTATION

AFTER the unfortunate issue of the Worms conference, the Protestant princes determined, as supreme heads of their own churches, to try to do by themselves what they had not been able to accomplish with the help of the theologians ; and as soon as they had restored unity to their disjointed ecclesiastical organisation they intended bringing the theologians to order by forcible measures.

Duke Christopher of Würtemberg, the son of Duke Ulrich, who had died on November 6, 1550, took up most zealously the idea of a convention of princes which, ‘by divine aid, was to re-establish Christian concord.’ In the prosecution of his scheme he met with encouragement from most of the princes, and also from the Elector, Augustus of Saxony, who for some years past had always objected to such an assembly being held. A further proposal of the Duke’s to summon a general Protestant synod was, however, rejected. Melanchthon, whom Christopher had consulted on the subject, was decidedly opposed to such a synod, for he said it would only give rise to fresh disaster and fresh acrimony among the different parties at strife with one another.¹ In a letter

¹ Kugler, ii. 71-77.

to King Christian III. of Denmark, dated January 26, 1558, Melanchthon had advised that ‘the sovereign’ rulers should convene together a body of learned and God-fearing men who, in the presence of a certain number of Christian princes, should deliberate in proper form on certain important points. ‘And,’ he added, ‘there are some princes in Germany who are very anxious for such a conference. But it is essential that they should not go too much into detail, and that there should first of all be a consultation among the princes not only as to the subject-matter to be discussed, but also as to the resolutions to be passed,’ lest the princes quit the convention in disunion.¹

The gathering of the princes was to be coincident with the diet at Frankfort, at which the imperial power was to be made over to King Ferdinand.

On March 18, 1558, the Electors of Saxony, Brandenburg, and the Palatinate, the Counts Palatine Frederic and Wolfgang of Zweibrücken, Duke Christopher of Würtemberg, the Landgrave Philip of Hesse, and the Margrave Charles of Baden all came to agreement respecting the so-called Frankfort Recess, which was drawn up on the basis of a memorandum sent in by Melanchthon.² ‘The Protestants,’ so ran the document, ‘have been falsely charged with being divided in regard to their true creed, through which alone salvation was assured.’ They all acknowledged the Confession of 1530, and the apology for the same. Since, however, certain controversial speeches and pamphlets had proceeded from the evangelicals, it was advisable that there should be an explanation on the matter. This proposed explanation related to the doctrines of justifi-

¹ *Corp. Reform.* ix. 432-433.

² *Ibid.* ix. 489-507.

cation, of good works, of the Eucharist, and of the Adiaphora or ‘middle things,’ concerning which, since the date of the Leipzig interim of 1548, a violent dispute had sprung up between the strict Lutherans on the one hand, with Flacius at their head, and Melanchthon and his disciples on the other.

Among the number of these ‘middle things’ which, because they were quite unimportant, had been allowed to be retained when most of the Catholic usages were abolished, those who defended them counted especially the use of consecrated vessels and choir vestments, candles on the altars, and images of saints. Flacius, however, and all his associates considered all this as ‘whoredom with the Antichrist,’ and insisted that the use of choir vestments and lights was a sin against the Holy Ghost. The decision of the Frankfort Recess with regard to the ‘middle things’ was that they might only be retained in places where ‘the pure teaching of the Gospel’ was not adulterated or persecuted, for otherwise ‘not only the moderate ones, but all ceremonies whatever, were dangerous.’

The Recess was to be recognised henceforth as a fixed rule of doctrine, and the princes decided that if in future any dispute should arise on any of the articles formulated by them, they would confer together on the subject with the other Protestant Estates. Meanwhile they must not allow anything to be taught in their territories, churches, and schools, or preached, or in any way introduced among the people, that was at variance with their fixed and true confession of faith. No writing on religious matters ‘must be allowed to issue from the press without having first been submitted to the appointed censors, and by them pronounced in accordance

with the right and true creed.' The publication of libellous pamphlets was forbidden under severe penalty. The consistories and superintendents were to be provided with 'Christian' directions as to the way in which, in case of dissensions, they were to proceed against the offending parties ; no individual, much less a whole evangelical church, was to be condemned without a trial. If it should come to light that anybody had in reality taught, or acted, in opposition to the Augsburg Confession, such a recreant and misguided person was no longer to be retained in his office of teacher or in the service of the Church ; and the other princes and Estates must be informed of the fact, to prevent the possibility of any heretical teacher receiving promotion or a fresh appointment.

The efforts of the Protestant princes met with hearty support from King Maximilian of Bohemia, the eldest son of the Emperor, who had openly expressed his approval of the Augsburg Confession to Duke Christopher of Würtemberg. Maximilian had built great hopes on the Worms conference, and had thought to be able to arrange that Ferdinand should preside over it in person.¹ It was with great regret, he wrote to Christopher on December 20, 1557, that he had learnt of the fruitlessness of the conference, though no doubt 'many of the devil's menials' would be able to bear this news with great equanimity. 'That great pattern of honour, the Pope,' he said, had sent word to his father through an ambassador that he thanked God that the conference had been wrecked by the schism among the Protestants themselves, and he hoped that Ferdinand would clear the Empire from 'this plague of heresy,' and would

¹ Kugler, ii. 35, note 59.

never again give in to such colloquies and conventicles. ‘This was pretty nearly his honest or, in plain language, his diabolical message.’ In the year 1557 Maximilian helped on the dissemination of heresy in Poland. Shortly before the Frankfort Diet he had asked Duke Christopher to supply him with writings of Luther, Melanchthon, Brenz, and other theologians ‘of the true faith.’ A few months after the Frankfort Recess had been drawn up he told the Duke of his wish that the Protestants might become united in their faith, for, said he, ‘by union among themselves they will cut the Pope’s throat.’ Christopher replied to Maximilian on July 13, 1558, that he would exert himself loyally and strenuously to bring about unification in order that ‘the tyranny of the Antichrist might be put down.’ On July 17 he made inquiries from Maximilian concerning the health of the Emperor, adding that there was a rumour ‘that the doctors gave little hope of his life. In the event of the death of Charles he promised to devote himself to the service of Maximilian.’¹

‘How excellent will it be, at last, for the united evangelicals, and how the Popish idolaters will wail and lament,’ wrote a preacher in 1558, ‘when the noble Maximilian, as is to be hoped, proclaims and protects the pure Gospel from the imperial throne as chief shepherd of the Church !’²

¹ Letters of Maximilian and Christopher in Le Bret, pp. 9, 85, 107, 110, 112, 122, 124, 126. On July 18, 1556, the Ratisbon Superintendent, Nicholas Gallus, wrote to Duke John Albert of Mecklenburg concerning King Maximilian, who had stopped at Ratisbon on his way to Brussels: ‘His Court preacher, who is a married man, and who is all in favour of the pure doctrine, has spoken to me in great praise of his sovereign’s Christian understanding and temper’ (Schirrmacher, *Johann Albrecht Herzog von Mecklenburg*, ii. 358).

² *Wider die papistischen Gräuel von der Messe, &c.* (1558), Bl. 7.

But no Protestant unity resulted from the Frankfort Recess, which only served, on the contrary, to strengthen the existing schism and discord, and became now the butt of attacks from all directions.

At a meeting of Mecklenburg theologians at Wismar, it was resolved, in accordance with a statement of David Chyträus, that in this Frankfort Recess the doctrinal articles had been couched in equivocal language, and that 'they might be subscribed to by Sacramentarians and other sects, as well as by the true Churchmen.' In consequence of this statement the Duke of Mecklenburg refused to sign the Recess.¹ His lead was followed by the Duke of Pomerania, the Prince of Anhalt, the Count of Henneberg, and the towns of Ratisbon, Nuremberg, Hamburg, Lübeck, Lüneburg, and Magdeburg.²

The theologians of Magdeburg declared that they could not, without consideration, accept any one of the articles as they stood in the Recess. 'To begin with,' they said, 'it was a most dangerous and suspicious thing' that secular princes and lords should have undertaken, without the concurrence of theologians, to formulate and fix a rule of faith; all the more so as their own theologians had been publicly accused of being the authors of various errors. Such a proceeding was tantamount to 'stopping the mouth of the Holy Ghost' so that He might henceforth no longer punish errors, and pronounce judgment against false prophets. If this Recess was imposed on the consistories, nothing would be easier than for another Papacy to spring up, as had been already flagrantly exemplified by other consistories. Moreover, if the consistory themselves should

¹ Krabbe, *Chyträus*, pp. 135-143.

² Salig, iii. 368-373, 383.

start erroneous opinions, were other preachers not to withstand them ?

Duke John Frederic of Saxony came forward as the chief opponent of the Recess, and endeavoured to collect around him in a compact party the whole body of Protestants who also disapproved of it. To this end he invited the Estates of the nether Saxon circle to enjoin their theologians to meet at a convention at Magdeburg, and there to pronounce wholesale condemnation on all the different sects. The Estates, however, were of opinion that this was too serious a step, and the Duke then followed the advice of Flacius, his chief theologian —namely, that he and his brothers should issue a pamphlet refuting and repudiating everything that was erroneous, and that all the clergy of the land should be compelled to accept the refutation. John Frederic caused a pamphlet of this description to be composed by a group of theologians, and had it revised by Flacius, and on November 28, 1558, he notified to the theologians his approval of their work. The pamphlet was sent round to the different superintendents as a directory manual of doctrine, and preachers were enjoined to read it out from their pulpits.¹

This compilation, which was entitled the ‘Confutation Book of the Duke of Saxony,’² although insignificant as a scientific work, belongs unquestionably to the most

¹ Preger, ii. 77-79.

² *Johannes Friedrichs V. des Mittleren, Herzogen zu Sachsen, in Gottes Wort, prophetischer und apostolischer Schrift gegründete Confutationes, Widerlegungen und Verdammung etlicher ein Zcit her zuwider demselben Gotteswort und heiliger Schrift, auch der Augsburgischen Confession, Apologien und der Schmalkaldischen Artikeln, aber zu Förderung und Wiederanrichtung des antichristischen Papstthums eingeschlichenen und eingerissnen Corruptelen, Secten und Irrthumen.* Jena, 1559.

important polemical writings of the day. It gives a vivid insight into Protestant sectarianism at that time. Backed by the name of a prince, and claiming the authority of a rule of faith, it expounds, in sharp and often passionate condemnation of all diverging opinions, the views of strict Lutheranism, the one and only saving creed. It asserts that immediately after the days of the Apostles falsehood and corruption had crept into the Church, and that in the Antichrist kingdom of the Pope, through the working of the devil, these evils had grown worse and worse, until God sent forth a new apostle in the person of Luther and revealed His Holy Word afresh. Nevertheless, says the Duke in his preface, men have grown ‘almost everywhere weary of and disgusted with this true, Divine Word ; they have set up all sorts of intermediary things in opposition to God’s Word, and have so misled men’s consciences and shaken their faith that they actually do not know and cannot decide what, in regard to God’s Word, they ought to do and what not.’

As false teachers, who, under the evil influence of the devil, were subverting the Evangelical Church, the following men and sects are then discussed and repudiated : Servet, Schwenckfeld, the Antinomians, the Anabaptists, the old and new Zwinglians, the defenders of free will, Osiander and Stancarus, Major, and also the Adiaphorists. These last, the Melanchthonians, were stigmatised as ‘declared enemies of the Cross of Christ ; they were worse than snakes and venomous poison ; they were foxes more dangerous than those open wolves, the Papists.’¹

It was also most essential, the argument went on,

¹ Bl. 126, 129^b.

to make an open stand against those insolent and bare-faced enemies who, on account of the adiaphoristic, hypocritical incident, considered themselves to some extent victorious, and hoped to establish their idolatry ; ‘they must be made to see that God had still preserved to Himself a holy seed and a remnant of true believers who had not yet bowed the knee to Baal nor signed themselves with the sign of the Beast.’¹ The adiaphoristic ‘idolatrous trafficking’ with the Beast of the Apocalypse, that ‘monstrous Antichrist’ the Pope, must be encountered by public testimony ‘even should the world be smashed up in consequence.’ ‘To keep silence in the matter is to expose to a state of fearful impenitence all those who pollute themselves with Babylonish whoredom.’ If the antagonists should ‘make much palavering about lasting peace, unity, and friendship, no reliance must be placed on their words,’ neither must any heed be paid if they should threaten war and calamity, for every risk must be avoided of coming under the bondage of papal tyranny.² All persons who do not agree with the confutation are under the influence of the devil ; the confutists alone are ‘the holy seed and the elect of God, whom God has reserved to Himself unto these last days of the world.’ And also ‘at the day of judgment, when all things shall be rent asunder, there will remain at least some among the teachers to whom God, through the Holy Ghost, will give eagle eyes that they may be able to spy heresy out and expose heresy.’³

Duke John Frederic and his brothers made it obligatory on their subjects to renounce and abhor the errors

¹ Bl. 123^a.

² Bl. 112^b, 126, 127.

³ Bl. 132.

condemned in the ‘Book of Confutation,’ as well as their defenders. If they did not comply with this injunction they were made to understand that they would come under the heavy displeasure of their sovereign lords and suffer the severest penalties.

But, like the Worms conference and the Frankfort Recess, this ‘Book of Confutation’ only widened the breach between the Protestant Estates. ‘Now,’ wrote Melanchthon, ‘we shall see still greater dissension and disquietude.’¹

The Elector Augustus of Saxony called on the University of Wittenberg to pronounce their opinion on the ‘Book of Confutation,’ and Melanchthon drew up a memorandum in the name of his colleagues. He made it clear, to begin with, that he and the Wittenbergites must not be charged with the errors of Servet, Osiander, Schwenckfeld, and the Anabaptists, and appealed in his defence to dogmas which were certainly taught by Protestant theologians, but which were not in the book. ‘The confutists,’ he said, ‘wish to be regarded as the most enthusiastic of Pope devourers, but they strengthen the cause of idolatry and introduce doctrines which no one in the Church, even from the very beginning, not even the Papists, have ever held—for instance, that the Body of Christ is everywhere and in all places, even in wood and stone. Filthy assertions such as this have caused great rancour and discord in Bremen and other places, and have also been the cause that many respectable and learned people and wealthy burghers have been driven away from Brunswick and Hamburg.’²

¹ Bl. 132.

² *Corp. Reform.* ix. 731, 738. See Wolf, *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Protestantenten*, p. 151 f.

Formerly, as Luther's pupil, Melanchthon had most emphatically taught that everything happened through unalterable and eternal necessity ; that in the order of God's universe there was no room for the expression of a free created will ; and consequently no freedom either of outward or inward action. Now he rejected this doctrine as madness. ' During Luther's lifetime and afterwards,' Melanchthon wrote, ' I have always repudiated this stoic and manichæan folly which Luther and others believed in, that all works, good and bad alike, in all men and women, good and bad alike, happen of necessity. It is manifest that such a statement is contrary to the Word of God, and prejudicial to all moral discipline, and blasphemous against God.' ' The doctrine that good works are necessary is the right and true one, and one that no devil can have power to destroy. New obedience is necessary, new obedience is a debt we owe. And we must uphold this doctrine in the face of the Antinomians, who cry out senselessly that the regenerate remain holy even if they fall into sins which their conscience reproves, even if they commit adultery and murder.' An Antinomian had said to him some years ago, ' God does not concern Himself about our good works.' Now the poets of Weimar have not declared that these propositions are right and true—viz. : ' New obedience is a duty, is necessary,' but they combat them artfully with wiles and sophistry. When, however, they tilt at the added words ' necessary to salvation,' they know well that we do not use these words. True, one of the great ranters, Gallus, at Ratisbon, has unmistakably rejected these propositions ; against him we appeal to all God-fearing Christians whose sentence we are willing to accept, for the

Weimar condemnations are not the only ones to be heard.'¹

This memorandum gave rise to further condemnations of Melanchthon. At Berlin the Court preacher Agricola exhorted the people from the pulpit to pray against him : ‘ Pray to God, I beseech you, against this beautiful, new, angelic, noonday devil, who has now come forward again and insists that good works are necessary even for the righteous and for believers, whereby we should again lose the all-sufficient Christ and His Gospel.’ But the Berlin Provost, George Buchholzer, wrote to Melanchthon : ‘ I, on my part, will teach the exact opposite of his prayer on Sundays, and will supplicate the Almighty to destroy the wicked black devil who is endeavouring to introduce a savage, lawless, dissolute mode of life in opposition to God’s commands.’²

It was a war of all against all.

The Landgrave Philip of Hesse sent Duke John Frederic a ‘ censure ’ of his book, which Flacius considered very damaging, and deserving the severest punishment. Flacius was so merciless to Philip that ‘ in an answer to the Landgrave’s pamphlet ’ he asked, with reference to the latter’s bigamy, ‘ if, as the “ Censurer ” implies, it is only those Anabaptists who have taken up the sword who are to perish with the sword, what is to be done with all the blood-relations of that sect—viz. the Anabaptists who are building up a new Sodom, and have several wives like the Turks ? ’³

In order to prevent an open breach between the

¹ *Corp. Reform.* ix. 763–775. See Wolf, *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Protestantenten*, p. 153.

² *Corp. Reform.* ix. 815, 816.

³ Preger, ii. 81–83.

Protestant Estates, the princes who had drawn up the Frankfort Recess invited Duke John Frederic to a conference. Everything was settled, and Fulda fixed on as the place of meeting, January 20, 1559, as the date, when the Elector Augustus of Saxony raised objections, fearing a preponderance of the hostile party in that place.¹ On March 20, 1559, Melanchthon, in a letter to Philip of Hesse, again expressed himself as opposed to the holding of a general Protestant synod. He granted that such a synod was highly necessary, but ‘how it was possible to hold one he could not see.’ ‘At Hamburg,’ he wrote, ‘there is a preacher named Westphalus who thunders out from the pulpit such statements as the following: “The God-fearing and learned men in England, who have punished the idolatry of worshipping bread, are the devil’s martyrs.” And at Bremen also there are ranters of this sort, who are encouraged by a numerous following.’ ‘If, now, a synod were convoked, and if it were not managed with a very firm hand, the result would only be an enormous increase of schism. But who, I ask, is competent to preside over our synods when there are such endless points to be discussed, and the princes and preachers are all at war with one another?’²

While all these quarrels and contentions were raging among the theologians, the preachers, and the princes, it was the earnest endeavour of one and all to root out from their own dominions ‘the very last remnants of the hellish Papacy,’ and, by all means in their power, to turn the Catholics from their ancient faith; while at the same time they aimed, and this chiefly by the sup-

¹ Heppe, *Gesch. des Protestantismus*, i. 291 ff.

² Corp. Reform. ix. 779, 780.

pression of the ‘ Ecclesiastical Reservation,’¹ to conquer new territories for ‘ the new religion which was the only way to salvation,’ and the doctrines of which were the theme of general strife among them.

The princes who displayed most activity in this respect were the Palatine Electors Otto Henry and Frederic III., and Duke Christopher of Würtemberg.

¹ Decision of the Augsburg Treaty of 1555 ‘that Catholic priests joining the Evangelical Church should give up their benefices.’

CHAPTER IV

RELIGIOUS INNOVATIONS IN THE PALATINATE
SINCE 1556

THE new religion had already been promulgated in the Palatinate for the space of ten years under the rule of the Elector Frederic III., and in March 1556 an edict issued by his successor, Otto Henry, raised it to the dignity of sole state religion. No popish idolatry was in future to be tolerated in the country. The new Church organisation was based on the Confession of Augsburg, but ‘some traces of a Zwinglian spirit were also visible in it ;’ for instance, in the ceremony of baptism the exorcism was to be omitted ; and all images, with the exception of the crucifix, and all the altars, were to be removed from the churches, and destroyed as idolatrous abominations. When the ‘idols’ had been taken away from the Church of the Holy Ghost at Heidelberg, the Elector issued an order for general iconoclasm throughout the land. Electoral commissioners were charged to remove the images and pictures from the churches ‘in the watches of the night,’ to ‘break in pieces the sculptures and to daub all the paintings with black ;’ also ‘to destroy all windows that had painted glass.’ The commissioners reported that, ‘owing to the dismantling of churches and the removal of pictures and images, they had been met by the people with all manner of reproaches and insults.’

On the strength of the assertion that ‘all vows are impious, and every form of monasticism an abomination before God,’ the suppression of the still remaining cloisters was set on foot, and orders issued for the sequestration of their revenues. The innovators stopped short at nothing. In the monastery of Waldsassen, for instance, although it was under the protection of the Bohemian Crown, the Elector inhibited the Catholic Church service, took away the ornaments of the church, and appointed Lutheran preachers. In order to induce the monks to adopt the new teaching, lewd women were shut up with them in their cells. The abbot and several of the monks who refused to obey, and clung steadfastly to their faith, were led away to prison at Amberg by the Elector’s orders.¹ The most merciless treatment was also often shown towards nuns advanced in years. The proceedings at Gnadenberg afford an instance of this. When the electoral commissioners made their appearance in this convent in November 1556, in order to inform the nuns that their ‘vows were the devil’s work,’ their religion ‘idolatry, blasphemy, and a mere misleading human invention,’ they met with insurmountable opposition from ‘these stiff-necked women.’ In touching language the abbess and the whole body of nuns urged on the commissioners that ‘In the outside world there was nothing but envy, hatred, persecution, and faithlessness; vices innumerable went on multiplying day by day; they themselves were all old and useless persons; they had brought their little all into the convent, and they intended to go on living up to their vows in willing

¹ Wittmann, *Reformation in der Oberpfalz*, pp. 19, 20, 24, 25; *Religionsneuerungen in der churfürstlichen Pfalz*, pp. 72–73.

poverty, fasting, and prayer. They knew nothing else from the Word of God but that their faith and religion were right and true, and they begged that they might be left in the enjoyment of these.' In vain did they supplicate for mercy and pity. The preacher who had come with the commissioners took away the consecrated elements from the tabernacle, and also the chrism, whereupon the nuns' father confessor, a feeble, sickly old man, 'got angry and protested with gruesome, violent gestures.' But the commissioners, 'having regard to the orders issued by the Elector,' took no notice of these protests; 'but, for the destruction of idolatry, went through with their work.' The poor, infirm old man, in the bitter cold of the winter, was compelled to leave the convent at once. It was in vain that the nuns remonstrated, saying that 'for nine years long he had spent much labour and trouble among them, and had always behaved honourably in every way. And now he is accused of having misled us! This is not true. Oh, dear sirs, in the name of God believe what we say!' When the sisters saw that all their entreaties to be left in their convent and in the practice of their faith were unavailing, they begged that they might at least be allowed to receive back what they had brought in with them, and to go away where they liked. But even this petition was refused. They were hurried off to the convent of Seligenporten, which had just been Protestantised, and Gnadenberg was taken possession of.¹

¹ Report of the Commission in the *Histor.-Diplomat. Magazin*, ii. 395-414. See Wittmann, pp. 21-23. In October 1556 the Elector issued orders that all the field churches in which there was not a weekly sermon and administration of the Sacraments should be demolished. Such is the report of K. Menzel, *Wolfgang von Zweibrücken* (München, 1893), p. 140, according to the 'Acten des Amberger Kreis archivs.'

What the nuns of Gnadenberg said concerning the increase of crime and vice is fully confirmed in the reports of the Lutheran commissioners, as well with regard to the Rhenish as to the Upper Palatinate. We quote the following extracts from a report of November 2, 1556: ‘Church discipline, as it used to be enforced in olden times among the clergy, has disappeared, and the door has been thrown open to sin and vice ; so that each one companies at his pleasure, and without rebuke from anybody, with false doctrine and scandalous living.’ The bulk of the people are given up to godless and epicurean living ; others, shocked and frightened by the terrible disorders and scandals that go on, attach themselves to any sect which has an appearance of respectability, and outward decorum and piety ; a very small number, alas, hold firmly to the revealed Word of God.’ To the list of ‘common failings and iniquities’ which were found in all classes and professions belonged first of all the careless and irregular church-going of so many people, who either never went at all, or else went reluctantly just to hear the sermon ; secondly, the contempt and disregard of the Holy Sacraments shown by the greater number of those who in other respects plumed themselves on being clever and intelligent. Thirdly, there were very few places where catechetical instruction was given. ‘And even when classes for this purpose had been started in some parishes, they had had to be given up because neither young nor old attended them.’ Further, ‘almsgiving for the help and maintenance of the poor had been given up in many places.’ The churches ‘as a rule were not kept in repair, and their revenues were applied to other purposes.’ The incomes of most of the ministers are

so small that ‘they can neither buy themselves books nor decent clothing, and when they die their widows and children are reduced to begging.’ A large number of livings were unoccupied. For instance, in the whole district of Lützelstein there were only four clergymen. ‘The people are wild and undisciplined ; they live unthinkingly like brute beasts, and pay little heed to the ministers of religion.’¹

The reports from the Upper Palatinate were equally distressing, as the following extracts will show :

‘In most cases the ministers are excessively indolent, so much so that up to the present time very few of them have given any catechetical instruction or any religious teaching to children. From this it will easily be seen how few people there must be who know how to say their prayers, or understand the right use of the Sacraments.’ ‘And what is even worse, we have come across some who knew nothing whatever about salvation and righteousness ; who could not say their prayers, and, indeed, did not trouble themselves about doing so, but said that the heavenly Father would certainly put into each one’s heart how he is to be saved ; and that the Father has atoned for sins, but the Son has borne the suffering’ (*sic*). ‘The parishes are so wretched, and in the charge of such unsuitable persons, that it is impossible to get rid of all the good-for-nothing parsons.’ ‘In very many places we found that not only were the Church regulations not attended to, but that such fearful anarchy had crept in, that very few of the clergy were of the same mind, and each one ruled as he liked,

¹ Report of the Visitation of Churches by the Commissioners appointed by their Electoral Graces in the year 1556, dated November 2, in Schmidt, Part i. 39.

and only did what was most convenient to himself.' 'Owing to the laziness of the clergy, private absolution has been entirely given up; people who are thoroughly wicked and quite intolerable persons are admitted to the Eucharist; preaching has altogether ceased.' 'Besides all which, many ministers of the Church lead immoral lives, which causes scandal among the neighbours, and gives rise to disparaging talk among the Papists. The improvement which they have promised goes on chiefly in the public-houses.' The commissioners further stated that 'the ministers made a general complaint that contempt of God's Word and worship had reached such a pitch that at the very time that services were being held, drinking-bouts, low dancing, gambling, and so forth went on unpunished; blasphemy, witchcraft, and debauchery were rampant; several people had been three times convicted of adultery; drunkenness and other vices were so terribly in the ascendant, that the judgments pronounced against these things in God's Word were mocked at, and it was patent to all that heathendom had grown up all around.' At Hirschau and in other places the members of the town council kept away from the Sacraments, spoke of them jeeringly, did not consider them necessary to salvation, were negligent in the punishment of crime, and profligacy and all sorts of wicked arts were carried on to excess.' 'Woe, woe unto those that shall come after us!' the commissioners exclaimed.

With regard to Church property it was stated that 'the founded revenues of many parishes went partly into the electoral coffers, partly for ordinary building purposes, although it was clear as daylight that Church property, when put to profane uses, devoured and de-

stroyed the other rightful possessions of the despoiler. These revenues must now be restored as a good example to all the nobles and burghers, so that they also may deliver up all that they have taken away from the Church goods.'¹

The commissioners of the Rhenish Palatinate urged on the Elector with equal insistence that 'Many people, both of high and low degree, are kindling God's wrath and indignation against them and theirs, because they take to themselves the goods given over to God and His Church, and by so doing bring loyal ministers of the Church to poverty and need, and cause the service of the Church not only to be despised, but also to perish from neglect and want of pastors. Experience too shows, alas, that these robberies of the Church have brought great and irrecoverable injury to the German nation, for those who have been guilty of them, be they rulers of greater or lesser importance, have not only not grown richer through their thefts, but have, on the contrary, become impoverished, and are now obliged to mortgage and oppress their lands and people.'

This report was an opportunity for the Lutheran commissioners to pay a high tribute of praise to the Catholic ancestors of Otto Henry. 'Your Electoral Grace's parents and ancestors,' they said, 'were all highly renowned and powerful electors and sovereigns, rich in land and people, although they did not appropriate the goods of the Church, but, on the contrary, looked after the churches well, and endowed them richly out of their own possessions.' They went on to beg that the Elector would follow in their steps and leave the revenues of the Church for the maintenance of the

¹ In Wittmann, pp. 24-25.

Church worship, and thus ‘ give public testimony before all the world that he had his religion really at heart, and was not, like so many others, merely seeking his own profit under the cloak of the Gospel.’¹

When Otto Henry died in February 1559, the condition of ecclesiastical affairs was quite anarchical. At Heidelberg, Melanchthon had written as early as 1557, there were many heads and many opinions, and people from various nations—Belgians, French, and others.²

Strange to say, it was on the recommendation of Melanchthon, who afterwards greatly deplored the fact, that Tilmann Hesshus, who had been banished from Rostock, was appointed first professor of theology, pastor of the Church of the Holy Ghost, and superintendent-general and president of the Church council at Heidelberg. He became the leader here of the strict Lutherans, while Zwinglian-Calvinistic opinion had for its representatives, among others, the theologian Boquin, a former Carmelite prior of Bourges, Thomas Erast, of Basle, professor of medicine, and the Court preacher, Diller. At the Court of Heidelberg, also, Zwinglianism boasted many adherents, much to the distress of the Chancellor von Minckwitz and the Court Judge Erasmus von Benningen, who were on the side of the superintendent-general. Hesshus became forthwith entangled in quarrels with several of his clergy; only once did the whole clerical body act in concert, and that was on the occasion of an appeal to the town council of Frankfort-on-the-Main on behalf of a preacher who had knocked down a Catholic priest with his fists, and rolled him over in the mud.³

¹ In Schmidt, *Division*, pp. 51–52. ² *Corp. Reform.* ix. 127.

³ Wilkens, pp. 40–46.

Under the new Elector, Frederic III., ‘the religious schism broke out into raging flames.’

Frederic III., of the Simmern line, had been won over to Lutheranism by his wife, Maria, daughter of the Margrave Casimir, of Brandenburg Culmbach, but at the time of his accession he had already developed Zwinglian-Calvinistic views. The Electress trembled lest her consort should come completely under the dominion of ‘the subtle poison’ of Zwinglianism. When her son-in-law, Duke John Frederic of Saxony, expressed the hope that ‘the Christian religion would be re-established in the land and the devil’s rabble got rid of,’ she answered : ‘It is indeed to be desired, for I fear that the devil will sow the Zwinglian seed among the good grain ; I know of some among the town councillors who are undoubted Zwinglians.’¹

Hesshus considered it his first official duty to make a bold stand for the ‘unaltered Augsburg Confession and Apology,’ to which, on his assumption of office, he had pledged himself by oath ; but even his own followers asked ‘whether the thousand demons that he brought with him to the pulpit were likely to further the cause of the pure Lutheran gospel.’ His chief antagonist was the deacon William Klebitz, an equally ardent combatant in defence of the Calvinistic doctrine of the Eucharist. Hesshus denounced him from the pulpit as a second Arius, a blasphemer of the Sacrament, a new devil, and he also accused the university and the city magistrate of heretical tendencies. Klebitz in revenge ‘ inveighed with equal insolence against Hesshus.’²

¹ Kluckhohn, *Letters*, i. 40.

² It often happened to Tilman Hesshus to have his name changed by his adversaries into Tollmann Geckhus (Ploughman-Woodhouse into Madman-Madhouse). See *Wider die schwermerischen Sacramentirer*, C².

Professors and students, officials and burghers, divided into parties and fought over the questions whether the bread at the Eucharist was the selfsame actual body of Christ as that which hung on the cross ; whether unbelievers also partook of it ; whether one ought to say that the body was presented under the bread, or in the bread, or in, with, and under the bread ? One man, Magister Conrad, proposed adding to these prepositions the words ‘ round and round.’ When the Elector interposed to calm down the general excitement, and in August 1559 prohibited all this reciprocal slandering and reviling in the pulpit, telling Hesshus that he must agree with his opponents in accepting the formula, ‘ The body of Christ is presented with the bread,’ Hesshus answered that this ‘ formula was not to be found in the first, or genuine, but in the altered edition of the Augsburg Confession.’ The Confession had been altered more than six times, he said, and in this way it had grown into a cloak of great magnitude, under which both God and the devil could easily hide. ‘ It must first of all,’ he said, ‘ be settled by a synod how the Confession was to be understood ; and meanwhile they must abide by the Smalcald articles, in which Luther himself had couched his doctrine.’

Hesshus delivered sermons on the alterations of the Confession, inhibited Deacon Klebitz from all official duties, and, on his refusing to submit, solemnly pronounced the ban over him, instructed the municipal authorities to expel him from the country, and gave orders that nobody was to have any fellowship with this accursed heretic, wholly given over to the devil. Klebitz revenged himself by accusing Hesshus of

robbing the university's treasury ; another preacher spoke of him in the pulpit as a sow that ravaged the Lord's vineyard ; and a third pronounced the ban over him. Once, during divine service, matters almost came to a regular fight, Hesshus having given orders that when Klebitz began administering the Sacrament the chalice was to be snatched out of his hands.¹ On the failure of all the Elector's attempts to effect a reconciliation, Hesshus and Klebitz, on September 16, were dismissed from their posts. Hesshus now tried to get a synod summoned. For the true Lutheran Church, he said, there was no longer any room among all the blasphemous heresies, whose seeds were being scattered all over the world. Insatiable craving for new ideas and opinions was impelling the masses ; wanton souls were burning with uncontrollable lust to overturn all established dogmas ; no law restrained their frenzy ; Church discipline was dead ; princes and sovereigns were sunk in sleep. A synod of learned, orthodox, unsophistical theologians, versed in antique lore, must meet together to witness to the faith and to pronounce decision. True, it was objected that the tempers of teachers and hearers were so distracted that no such thing as unity was to be thought of ; the theologians were absorbed in their own private interests and preferred playing the part of turbulent demagogues to acting as gentle shepherds of their flocks ; they would regard a synod as a theatre for fresh dramatic scenes.

¹ Salig, iii. 433-460 ; Kluckhohn, *Friedrich der Fromme*, pp. 44-57 ; Wilkens, pp. 49-58. For the abominable state of things in Frederic III.'s 'New Jerusalem' at Heidelberg see Alberdingk Thijm, *Vroolijke historie van Ph. van Marnix heer v. St. Aldegonde en zijne vrienden*. Leuven, 1876 (German edition as third *Vereinsschrift der Görresgesellschaft für 1882*).

Nevertheless, there was still a remnant of good and faithful pastors in the land.¹

Controversial writings passed backwards and forwards. Erasmus von Benningen, judge to the Court of the Palatinate, wrote in 1589 to his friend Marbach at Strasburg: ‘By means of the public press we are making our own shame and disgrace more manifest than the brightest sunshine, and all with no better result than to trouble and perturb consciences more and more, and to enlarge the empire of the devil. There is no petty Calvinist cobbler but must needs write his own book to silence jurists and doctors, who in their turn do the same, privately and anonymously, or with assumed names. The earth ought to open and swallow up such demons, and all those Christians who are aware of and countenance such errors ought to be severely punished. It is a crime beyond every imaginable crime to tolerate such iniquity.’² A disputation carried on at Heidelberg, in June 1560, between the Saxon and Palatine theologians was as fruitless as all similar conferences had been.³ By an electoral decree of August 12, the whole body of preachers who had refused to agree to an article on the Eucharist formulated by Melanchthon, received their dismissal. The Elector at the same time instituted such violent

¹ In the dedication of his treatise on the presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist; see Wilkens, p. 60.

² Planck, 5^b, 369, note 49; Sudhoff, p. 77.

³ ‘The detailed Protocol of the Disputation,’ in Wigand, *De Sacramentario*, pp. 437–470. Caspar Peucer wrote concerning the Disputation to Hieronymus Baumgartner on August 1, 1560: ‘Non hoc agitur, ut salutaria adhibeantur remedia vulneribus ecclesiae, sed ut exasperentur illa et distractiones augeantur. Et in hac animorum exultatione et odiorum acerbitate, quae iniri possit ratio concordiae non video, praesertim singulis hoc unum conantibus, ut suis retentis ac defensis adversantes non audiant, sed iugulent’ (Strobel’s *Miscellanies*, iv. 83; see iv. 97).

measures against the Catholics that, as early as May 1560, Hesshus had feared a rising.¹ The Jews also, who had been tolerated up till then, were mercilessly drivén out of the country by Frederic III., who considered himself ‘a living member of the elect community predestined to eternal life.’²

While the Palatinate was ‘sucking in the Zwinglian poison, and becoming most foully corrupted by the Anabaptists,’³ the Count Palatine Wolfgang von Zweibrücken ‘was turning his territory into an undefiled habitation of the unfalsified gospel, and rooting out all popish atrocities and idolatry, and all heresy and error.’ He enjoined his subjects in the year 1557 ‘to show themselves always obedient to Lutheranism as being commanded by God Himself.’ Throughout his domain he ordered the destruction of all altars, images, and everything that could recall the Catholic worship, and those who would not submit were compelled to leave the land.⁴ ‘The noble Christian Prince Wolfgang,’ said one of his followers, ‘does not allow himself to be deterred from his labour of rooting out ill weeds and planting the Word of God, by the conscientious scruples

¹ ‘Elector Palatinus pergit in suo instituto. Utinam potius sana doctrina papatum studeret evertere, quam igne et violentis mandatis! Res ad aliquem motum spectat, principum, nobilium et vulgi animos graviter offendit novis illis incendiis et bonorum ecclesiasticorum, ut ferunt, corrassione’ (Struve, p. 103).

² See *Friedrichs Testament*, published by Kluckhohn (Munich, 1874), pp. 22, 53; Ritter, i. 199–200.

³ J. Scholz, *Ablehnung papistischer und sacramentorischer Argumente* (1561), ‘Preface.’ Concerning the further spread of Anabaptism in the Palatinate, wrote the preacher, John Flimmer, in an inspectorial report of September 17, 1556: ‘Misera Ecclesiae facies est circumcirca propter colluviem Anabaptistarum qui in tanta magistratus ecclesiastici et politici negligentia subintroierunt’ (Schmidt, Section lviii., No. 26).

⁴ Remling, *Reformationswerk*, pp. 139–144. See K. Menzel, *Wolfgang von Zweibrücken*, pp. 149 f.

of shoals of popish subjects, which are empty wind and to be despised as idolatrous. He is a true soldier of Christ, as is also that noble Prince Duke Christopher of Würtemberg, although he is not at all points in agreement with the Confession as it is taught at Würtemberg.¹

¹ Scholz. See preceding page, note 3.

CHAPTER V

RELIGIOUS INNOVATIONS IN WÜRTEMBERG UNDER
DUKE CHRISTOPHER

DUKE CHRISTOPHER of Würtemberg was impregnated with the idea that supreme spiritual authority was an inseparable appanage of secular sovereignty, and that spiritual rule was his first and most important duty. As the prince taught, so must the people believe. If some, he said, are of opinion that only secular authority belongs to the secular government, he for his part was convinced that he was actually called, 'first and foremost,' to provide the people subject to him with the pure teaching of the Gospel, to attend seriously to the interests of Christ's Church, and 'only afterwards, and as a secondary matter,' to busy himself about the organisation and administration of things secular.¹

In order to preserve purity of religious doctrine in his own principality, he first, in 1558, informed all the preachers of Würtemberg that they were to consider the confession of faith contained in the Frankfort Recess as the true standard of life and doctrine. He next issued a religious edict enjoining all public functionaries, down to the village bailiffs, to find out all stubborn sectarians—Sacramentarians, Anabaptists, Schwenckfeldians—to put them instantly in confine-

¹ Schmidt and Pfister, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, i. 58.

ment, and then to notify to the chancellor that nobody, under pain of bodily chastisement, banishment, or confiscation of goods, must house or shelter such traitors and miscreants.¹ Melanchthon, who in November 1557 still enjoyed the full confidence of the Duke,² in February 1558 came into ill-favour with his grace, under suspicion of heresy. Melanchthon, so the Duke wrote, in conjunction with the theological faculty at Wittenberg, ‘had published acrid and almost heretical pamphlets against Flacius and his followers.’ Moreover, ‘at Wittenberg and at Leipsic, all manner of disputations are said to have been held on the ubiquity of Christ, so that it was to be feared that a subtle form of Calvinism might creep in in these places: Philip also was suspected of having been concerned with the movement.’

Flacius, however, and his adherents at this same period aroused also the displeasure of the Duke, who uttered the following ominous words concerning them: ‘The time might come when a severe scrutiny would be held with regard to these aggressive ranters; for verily there was no other spirit in them than that of pride, envy, selfishness, and turbulence.’³ In the year 1559 he drew the attention of the Elector Augustus of Saxony to the fact that Melanchthon, in a commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians, had spoken in such a manner of Christ’s Ascension that the Zwinglians and Calvinists might boast that he agreed with them in this matter. Dangerous disturbances would follow ‘if it were taught and contended that the Saviour sat in His human form on the right hand of God, His heavenly

¹ Fischlin, *Suppl.* p. 275. See Hartmann, pp. 160–161.

² Kugler, ii. 163–164.

³ Kugler, ii. 164–165.

Father, circumscribed by space and locality.' He added that he considered it 'an imperative necessity' that the electors and princes who subscribed to the Augsburg Confession should meet together without delay to deliberate and to take the necessary measures for establishing unity of doctrine among the theologians, and for exterminating all sects and cabals.¹

In this same year Duke Christopher himself wrote out a confession of faith which only widened the breach between the Protestant parties.

Melanchthon's reiterated insistence on the logical impossibility of affirming the presence of the body of Christ, while at the same time denying the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, had moved the theologian Brenz to set up the doctrine that the body of Christ, by virtue of the union of the human nature with the Divine, shared in the omnipresence of the Godhead, and did not therefore first become present at the altar through consecration. This doctrine of the omnipresence or ubiquity of the body of Christ was raised to the rank of a dogma in a 'confession' formulated at a Stuttgardt synod, and invested with the authority of a symbol of faith.² Belief in the ubiquity of Christ's body, and in its reception by the unworthy and by unbelievers, became the distinctive marks of Lutheran orthodoxy.

To the strife and dissensions concerning the Eucharist, justification and free-will, was now added a dispute over the person of Christ. Melanchthon, in his private letters, wrote in bitter language of 'the poor Würtem-

¹ Pressel, *Anecdota*, pp. 462-464.

² Döllinger, ii. 363-364; Heppe, *Gesch. des Protestantismus*, i. 312-314.

berg abbots who, in their uncouth Latin, wanted to force new dogmas of faith on the Church.¹ The Würtemberg creed, he wrote to the Elector Augustus of Saxony, was as much opposed to the true teaching as was the doctrine of the Papists. Brenz, simultaneously and fiercely attacked by the Swiss and the Melanchthonians, and by the theologians of Wittenberg, Leipsic, and Heidelberg, grew more and more vehement in his abhorrence of Zwinglians and Calvinists. He declared war against the Sacramentarians and complete separation from their followers to be a divinely imposed duty. The devil, he said, was aiming at nothing less than by means of these teachers to introduce heathenism, Talmudism, and Mohammedanism into the Church. Even on his death-bed he exhorted the clergy of Stuttgart to cherish hatred against the teaching of Zwingli and Calvin, and enumerated the evils which must result from their doctrine and from attachment to it.²

By the Lutheran party it was regarded as a sign of patient endurance on his part that he had written in his will : ‘ I will not close the door of eternal salvation against those who come back honestly from Zwinglian error to the true faith and confession.’³

A considerable portion of the property of the Church had already been secularised under Duke Ulrich, but most of the benefices and religious foundations were confiscated by command of Duke Christopher after the religious peace had been concluded, and in spite of the stipulation in this treaty that not only the ecclesiastical

¹ *Corp. Reform.* ix. 1034.

² Döllinger, ii. 364–366.

³ ‘ Nolo iis, qui a Zwingliano errore ad veram fidem confessionemque ex animo revertuntur, januam æternæ salutis occludere.’ See Wundt, *Magazin*, ii. 90.

electors, princes, and Estates, but also ‘the colleges, monasteries, and men and women belonging to religious orders were to be left in undisturbed possession of their rents, revenues, tithes, and secular fiefs, and also of their other rights and privileges.’ Christopher secularised as many as sixty-eight abbeys and monasteries¹ without heeding the protests of those that could lay claim to immediate tenure under the Empire, and were therefore not subject to the Duke.

Imperial privileges and letters of protection, whether bestowed before or after the religious peace, were all disregarded. The ducal commissioners appointed to reform the monasteries declared again and again to the monks and nuns that, even if they could produce as many as a thousand imperial mandates, it would not trouble the Duke; they were in Würtemberg, and therefore Würtembergish, and no separate government would be created for them. What the Duke was doing, he had full right to do; he was even obeying the command of God, who strongly interdicted all monkish idolatry. The commissioners even refused to read the imperial charters of freedom and protection which were shown to them, saying that they knew beforehand what was written in them; the imperial chancellery took money and wrote down just what each one wished. They took possession of all documents, title-deeds, charters of privileges, and registers of lands in order that the corporations might not be able to appeal to them. The Duke, on one occasion, gave orders to spare only those documents which could in no way be brought up against him.²

¹ Feyerabend, *Jahrb. von Ottobeuren*, iii. 212–213.

² *Berichte der Rothenhäusler*, ii. 22, 75, 193.

With regard to the monasteries, Christopher acted according to the advice of his councillors ‘To abstain from using force, so as not to be accused of violating the Treaty of Passau ; to leave the present abbots to die out by degrees, and to be always on the watch to fill up the vacant posts at once with men who were willing to comply with the evangelical religion and with the Duke’s wishes.¹ For the monastery of Murrhard, a man of this description was found in Otto Leonard Hofsess, who pledged himself solemnly to abolish all idolatrous usages and not to receive priest’s ordination ; who in 1558, by the Duke’s permission, took unto himself a wife, and then began such a course of iniquity in the monastery that he was removed to the fortress of Neuffen, and had to esteem himself lucky in having his life spared. At Hirschau, in 1588, in spite of indignant protests, a Protestant coadjutor was forced on the abbot ; and at St. George’s the Mass was forbidden, and a new Church system introduced. On the abbot’s declaring that he would rather go about begging with staff in hand than let himself be forced to give up his religion, he was answered that he had a gracious prince who allowed him to carry on his own religion with his monks outside the Church.²

The abbeys of Blaubeuren and Adelberg held out the longest against the ‘Reformation.’ The Catholic abbots were not replaced by Protestant ones till 1563 at Blaubeuren, and 1565 at Adelberg.³

Like the Palatine Elector and other Protestant princes, Duke Christopher, so often celebrated by his Lutheran associates as a beneficent and righteous

¹ Schnurrer, pp. 238–239.

² *Ibid.* pp. 239–243.

³ Hartmann, *M. Alber*, pp. 167–168.

prince, behaved with special cruelty and inconsiderateness towards the nuns, although the latter, shut out from the whole world, could least of all be accused of popish conspiracy. The information we have on this subject, and which is chiefly taken from the reports of the commissioners themselves, deserves, for more than one reason, especial attention. In all materials at hand there is nothing whatever to confirm the general charges of immorality brought against the convents of that period ; on the contrary, they serve as convincing testimony to the irreproachable lives of those German women. They form also an index to a general knowledge of the sixteenth century, showing plainly as they do how little Christian toleration there was for the opinions of others, and how rough and rude conduct and character were at that time.

At the convent of Dominicanesses at Mariä Reuthin, near Wildberg, mass, monks, and priests, idols, bells, lamps, and other ‘relics of superstition’ had long since been abolished, but still the nuns had not yielded. In order once for all to break their constancy in accordance with evangelical exigencies, Balthasar of Güttlingen suggested to the Duke in 1556 that a cart should at once be got ready to carry off two of these obstinate nuns. He had used all his arts of persuasion, he said, to convince these women of their atrocious errors and of the idolatrous nature of their ceremonies, but in vain ; in vain, too, he had represented to them how much easier life was under the ‘Reformation.’ In the year 1559, according to the report of the commission, a ‘private examination’ was held in the case of each individual nun, and ‘all manner of persuasion used, especially with the younger ones,’ but ‘both in the

public and private interviews' they refused to be shaken from their faith and their vows.¹ The preacher who had been attached to the convent, represented at Stuttgart that if these nuns were allowed to continue any longer in their obstinacy, they would think there was no reality in the new religion. It would be humiliating for the Duke if they should get the better of him. The kingdom of God must be established, and all scandal avoided.² The nuns then wrote a touching letter to their relatives among the nobility imploring them to appeal to the Duke on their behalf. For many years, they said, they had devoted themselves heart and soul, and with the approval of their parents and friends, to the religious life; and so far as God had given them grace they had fulfilled their duties with diligence, and also, so they hoped and believed, conducted their lives and actions in such a manner as to injure no one and give offence to no one. But now that Lutheranism and all sorts of different sects and religious parties had invaded Germany, and the Holy Mass and the Christian Sacraments had been rejected, they had been repeatedly called upon to obey the ruling authorities, and to submit themselves to the new Würtemberg Church regulations. They had answered that it would not be right for them to forsake the holy, universal Christian Church which had existed for a thousand years, and had been handed down, in all its beauty and unity, from the time of the Apostles, and to take up another religion. They would only conform to whatever the council might decide. On this answer the Holy Sacrament had been taken out of the Church; communion under one species

¹ Rothenhäusler, p. 37 ff.; *Beilagen*, pp. 158–166.

² *Ibid.* pp. 175–177.

only prohibited, the Mass abolished, a Protestant preacher forced upon them, whose sermons they were compelled to attend, and 'finally things went to such a length that we had to choose between being driven out of the convent into misery and want, or at our souls' peril and against our wills, profession, and rule, deserting the Holy Catholic, Christian Church.'¹

The Clarisses (nuns of the order of Ste. Claire) at Pfullingen had been persecuted for eleven years under Duke Ulrich with a view to making them 'accept the gospel,' and acknowledge the Duke as their supreme lord in 'matters of conscience.' During these years they had been deprived of the Holy Mass, the Holy Sacraments, and all their religious books; eleven of the sisters had died without the consolations of religion. But in spite of all insults, oppression, and privations, not a single sister had been induced to renounce her faith.² Finally they had been driven out of their convent. At the time of the Interim, however, they had been allowed by Christopher to return, though with loss of all their possessions. But persecution had soon begun again. 'We are credibly informed,' wrote the Emperor Ferdinand to the Duke on March 9, 1559, 'that in the convent of Pfullingen there are, besides the abbess, fourteen or fifteen pious nuns who not only continue zealously in the practice of their laudable, ancient, Christian, Catholic faith, but also, in these troublous times of schism in religion, maintain such irreproachable conduct that no one can with truth lay anything unworthy to their charge.' Nevertheless, these poor nuns were left no peace in their religion and in their service of

¹ Rothenhäusler, pp. 173-175.

² See our quotations, Vol. v. pp. 412, 413.

God, and even in the extremity of death they were not allowed the ministrations of a priest ; and this in spite of the permission previously granted them. ‘ Attempts were also made to force them to give up the habit of their order, and to receive the Sacrament from the new preacher, with threats that if they refused they would be banished from the country and would not receive a penny out of the convent revenues. Further, the abbess and all her nuns were obliged to listen twice a week to sermons in the convent from a preacher of the new religion, and to pay the latter a fee of half a florin a week.’ The Emperor concluded by requiring of the Duke to cease these innovations and acts of tyranny in the convent.¹ Christopher called this letter ‘ sharp and incisive.’ An answer was prepared in the government chancellery, and it was stated, under appeal to the Religious Treaty of Augsburg, that ‘ The nuns at Pfullingen are my subjects, and as such they have no right to repudiate my religion and Church regulations, or to profess another religion in its stead. Hitherto I have had gracious patience with these erring sisters (for which they should be all the more grateful as I have authority to act very differently), and with all fatherly pity and lenity, for the sake of their souls’ salvation, I have had the pure Word of God preached and presented to them ; they have neither been threatened nor forced to the Sacrament.’ The imperial letter was all the more objected to because, as the Duke discovered, it had been written without the knowledge or suggestion of the nuns. The Duke’s councillors advised that no answer should be sent to the Emperor. It would be better, they urged, to wait for another injunction ; for it

¹ Besold, *Virg. Sacrarum Mon.* pp. 163–165.

was to be feared that his Imperial Majesty would institute an investigation, and his princely grace might become involved in further trouble.'¹ But the Duke should not any longer delay, the councillors further advised in this same year, to introduce the reformation into all the convents 'by practical steps ;' for these convents did nothing else than breed 'apostasy and idolatry, scandal and offence to consciences.'²

These 'practical steps' were to begin at Pfullingen.

According to the report of the commission, the nuns declared unanimously that 'they had no desire to treat with contempt the Duke's Confession of Faith, and the religion he had established, but they hoped these innovations were not going to be forced upon them.' 'The Mass and other ceremonies having been taken from them, they had omitted them ever since.' The preacher who had been forced upon them said that for four years past he had preached to them regularly on Sundays and holy days, and also once in the week, but without any result, although the nuns had been present at all his sermons ; 'they were a pack of stubborn old women, but if they were dealt with in sober earnest, he thought that some of them at any rate might be brought round.' Not one of them, however, was conquered. Later on the elder nuns implored that the steward placed over them might be enjoined to leave off henceforth tormenting them with his unchristian, offensive talk, and leave them in their old age to end their days in peace.³

The Duke's agents met with similar experiences in other convents.

¹ Besold, *l.c.*, pp. 166–169. See Rothenhäusler, pp. 21–23, 119.

² Besold, *l.c.*, pp. 171–172.

³ Rothenhäusler, pp. 23 ff.; *Beilagen*, pp. 144–149.

The Dominican nuns of Gnadenzell, at Offenhausen, were all of them interviewed alone, but ‘with old and young it was the same tune :’ they could not ‘let themselves be constrained against their conscience ; if they were to be turned out of their convents they must bear it.’ In the convent of Weiler, near Esslingen, the Dominican Sisters had been deprived of their Catholic worship since 1556, and were not even allowed to attend Catholic services elsewhere, but were compelled to listen to Protestant preaching. Not one of them, however, would renounce her faith. As faith was a free matter, they urged, and moreover the gift of God, and as they had always been told that it was not the Duke’s intention to coerce any one into giving up his or her faith, they begged that as poor women they might be treated with mercy and left in peace to keep their vows according to ancient tradition, and to enjoy their privileges as vouchsafed to them in imperial charters only newly received. Was it not, moreover, laid down in the Treaty of Passau and in the Augsburg Reichsabschied that people were not to molest each other on account of religion ?

In the Dominican convent of Steinheim-on-the-Murr, there was one case, and one only, of a nun apostatising. All the others remained steadfast. They hoped through the protection of the Emperor and of their protectors, the Counts of Hohenlohe, to escape the ‘Reformation.’ But in 1553 the Duke caused the convent to be besieged by a company of sixty infantry and cavalry. The soldiers broke in the windows, pulled down the stoves, and committed all sorts of wantonness in the church. Yielding to force, the nuns accepted the protection of the Duke, and were promised the free exercise of their religion at Steinheim and Ritenau.

The promise, however, was not kept. On July 14, 1556, so we read in the diary of one of the sisters, ‘the Prince’s councillors forbade us to practise our religion, to hear Mass, and to ring bells, and commanded us to adopt the Augsburg Confession. We protested vehemently, and complained that the promise made to us in 1553 had not been kept. We also asked for a month’s time for reflection. This was refused us, and we were told we must decide instantly ; if not we should provoke the Prince to great displeasure with us, and compel him at last to resort to force. Then we said that we were poor weak women, and could not resist force ; but that, whatever happened, we should remain true to our vows and our profession. We also supplicated that they would not do violence to our consciences.’ The Catholic Church service was abolished in the convent, and a preacher installed there. In November of the following year some more commissioners came with orders that the nuns were to acknowledge the Duke’s Confession of Faith, and were also to marry. In the convent regulations of Duke Ulrich for the year 1535, it had already been decreed that monastic persons who ‘had resolved to change their state in a Christian manner and go out of their convents’ should have a jointure settled on them, ‘whatever estate they entered into,’ excepting only if they continued still in the popish religion : ‘in such a case their income would at once be stopped.’¹ At Steinheim it was now threatened to enforce this decree. ‘Those nuns,’ said the commissioners, ‘who give up their order and accept the Augsburg Confession shall receive back the money they brought with them into the convent ; those, on the other hand, who persist

¹ Pressel, *Ambrosius Blaurer*, pp. 359–364.

in Popery will be driven out of the country.' To these threats the prioress and the nuns answered that, as regards their faith, they could not possibly give it up, for their consciences entirely forbade such a course; the Duke could not mean to coerce any one to act against the dictates of conscience. They protested against the forcible imposition of a preacher. But when the latter fell ill 'we took him food and drink twice every day for six weeks,' writes one of the nuns in her diary. 'May he rest in peace! Amen.' When the commissioners declared, in the name of the Duke, that every nun in the convent was free to renounce her profession and the rules of her order, and that the prioress had nothing to say in the matter, 'Then,' the diary goes on, 'we all stood up and said that we did not want freedom from our vows, but only wished to live and die in obedience to them; the abbess was our dear mother, and we wished for no better. The worthy Mother Abbess also said that it was her wish to live and die with us.' In the year 1560 followed another attempt to convert the stiff-necked nuns. 'On Lætare Sunday, March 24, Jörg von Helmstadt, Bastian Hornolt, and Hippolytus Resch came to the convent and read out the Prince's injunction that we were to agree to the Augsburg Confession and Würtemberg Reformation, and further that we were to be forbidden the exercise of our religion both in public and private, and that we were to have no more power over our own property. They compelled our steward to swear obedience to them. The next day they talked to each one of us separately, and made many promises to the young ones if they would leave the convent. But the whole sisterhood answered: "We humbly intreat that his princely grace would leave us all together in

our convent and in the exercise of our religion ; for we cannot accept all the above-mentioned articles ; it is against our conscience, and we will yield to no one.” Said the councillors, “ But you must ! ” Said we, “ Then we are overmastered, and we will appeal to God and to the world.”’ Later on the tenants of the convent were all compelled to swear allegiance. All in vain did the bailiff, the judges, and the whole parish protest that they had good rulers, of whom they had nothing to complain, and whom they did not wish to break with—namely, the ladies of the convent ; they had genuine letters, bearing the seals of many of the imperial cities, to witness that they were tenants-in-fief of the convent. Twenty mounted soldiers and a company of arquebusiers were despatched to teach them a different lesson. Bailiff, judges, and council were taken prisoners and carried off to Marbach, and all the villagers threatened that if they did not swear homage to the Duke ‘ their wives and children would be expelled from the village, the village would be sacked and destroyed, and all the men put to death.’¹

What were the rulers to do with this ‘conventual vermin,’ ‘this vagabond, abominable, blasphemous crew,’ ‘these pig-headed women’ who held out doggedly and patiently, and continued irreproachable in conduct in spite of being deprived of all their Church services and all their religious consolations ; who year by year

¹ This Diary was first published in full from the original in the Stuttgart State Archives, by Rothenhäusler’s *Beilagen*, pp. 178–193. Pfaff, in his *Miscellanies*, pp. 49–67, reproduced the greater part of it with altered orthography, and the omission of single passages : ‘The poor nuns,’ he remarks, ‘command our entire sympathy.’ Rothenhäusler’s article contains also fuller details concerning the treatment and the fate of the nuns of Weiler at Blaubeuren, of Kirchheim, Lichtenstern, Rechnetshofer, Herrenberg, Laufen, Ebingen, and Markgröningen.

did not refuse to attend the sermons of the Protestant ministers who had been imposed on them, but who, nevertheless, stood firmly and valiantly by their own faith, and kept their vows and maintained unflinchingly that in matters of conscience it was not the Duke of Würtemberg who was their lord and master ? All rights they had possessed over their own convent property, over the pious foundations and legacies of the ancient Church, had been taken from them ; should they now, finally, be turned out their convents, they asked themselves.

In 1564 a proposal was made by the Church councillors that all those nuns who persisted doggedly in the Catholic faith should either be turned out of the convents to which they belonged, or else shut up together in one conventional building. But this measure was considered dangerous, even by such theologians as John Brenz, James Andreä, Dietrich Schnepf ; and a few of the secular councillors were of the same opinion. ‘ It was to be feared,’ they said in a letter to the Duke, ‘ that the nuns would not let themselves be removed to other places, or shut up in a separate convent, without offering resistance, and raising a terrible feminine shindy ; they would be sure to fly for help to their friends among the nobles and the burghers, and to make appeal to the imperial privileges bestowed on their convent and their ecclesiastical colleges. The Emperor was their chief lord-protector, the Duke only second in authority over them, and it was contrary to the decrees of the Empire to eject them from their free colleges. It was quite likely that they themselves, or their relatives, would take measures by which the matter might be brought before the Emperor or the Imperial Chamber,

and grave complications and trouble might ensue. The best course for the Duke was not only to sternly forbid the nuns the practice of all popish ceremonies, but also to have all their prayer-books and reading-books taken out of their cells, and all images and books removed from the churches. In case of any nun falling ill, they must, under pain of severe punishment, call in a preacher. Also they must be forbidden to elect any new abbess or prioress in future, and they must be compelled to give up all secular administration.' 'The Lutheran steward was instructed that "in order that he might have better opportunities for inspection and for promoting Christian conversation, he and his wife were to have their meals with the nuns, who were not to be allowed any but Lutheran servant-maids. He was also to forbid these servants to take any letters or messages to the nuns without his knowledge. The keys of the convent gate were only to be trusted to the steward or his wife." "The superintendent must be enjoined to be diligent in his inspection both of the religious and domestic affairs of the convent, and to entertain the nuns frequently with religious colloquies." "For private colloquies of this sort are more profitable to such misguided women than public sermons." But if the nuns would not submit to these regulations then the Duke was fully warranted by the command of God to punish them as severely as their misconduct deserved, for the sake of example to others.'¹

In a contemporary publication entitled 'A Manual of Christian Complaint and Consolation,' we read as follows: 'When the day comes, as is to be hoped it will, that human and Christian feeling revives among

¹ Besold, *Virg. Sacrarum Mon.* pp. 237-240.

the Protestant oppressors and intimidators, they will blush with shame at the thought of all the outrageous and tyrannical actions perpetrated by them during such a length of time ; they will blush to think how for ten, twenty, thirty years and more, they cruelly persecuted and tormented poor defenceless nuns, feeble and infirm with age, in order to force them to renounce their faith. Oh what a mockery it is that these tyrants and abusers of power should exclaim everywhere that their gospel is Christian freedom, that they have no wish to tyrannise over consciences, when there could never have been worse tyrants than those men who do not scruple to go on unceasingly tormenting the consciences of the people, robbing them of the consolation of the Holy Sacraments, of the religious ministrations of consecrated priests, of all their prayer-books and devotional books, and even on their death-beds, in spite of their piteous entreaties, refusing them the Viaticum and Extreme Unction ! All the iniquities committed in German lands and cities are attested at the judgment-seat of God by the souls of thousands of consecrated nuns, who never did wrong to any one, and who asked for nothing more than permission to live and die in their ancient faith, even though their worldly goods should be taken from them, and they should be shut up within closed walls.'

‘ Dear Christian friend, tell me, I pray, even though you should not belong to the one Holy Church, what good has come of such tyrannical actions ? The confiscated Church and convent property has crumbled into dust, and a curse lies on it, as the Protestants themselves declare, a hundredfold. Have the poor, perchance, gained anything ? Has poverty grown lighter, or has it not rather become far heavier and more

widespread than before the schisms in religion, in the days of the one Christian faith ? Ask this question through the length and breadth of Germany, and the answer will be the same ; besides, you can see for yourself in villages and towns.' ' Has peace increased, my friend, or rather have not hatred, dissension, and enmity among high and low, learned and unlearned, clergy and laity, spread and multiplied ? Does peace dwell in our homes ? And what have you to say about the discipline of the young ? Could the rising generation be more ungovernable than it is ? ' ' While the great and the learned are wrangling about creeds and confessions, and every year setting up some new form of faith, each of which asserts itself as the only evangelical one, the common people no longer know whom and what to believe, and Christian love and charity have become things of the past. Unbelief, blasphemy, cursing, and swearing have grown so rampant, that numbers of preachers who would fain see better things, and are earnestly striving thereafter, are altogether in despair.'

' Tell me frankly, dear, true-hearted Christian, what good has come out of this new, contradictory, and ever-changing gospel ? The princes, too, like the learned biblical scholars, who glory in the Gospel, and set the people squabbling, are themselves fighting about the faith and wanting to wield the spiritual sword, while they neglect the secular sword of judgment ; and the Holy Empire, the beloved Fatherland, has grown weak and miserable, and become a laughing-stock to strangers.'¹

¹ *Christliche Klage- und Trostschrift für alle Christenmenschen* (1578), pp. 7-9, 11, 12. By the author of the '*Klage der Armen und Dürftigen*' ('Plaint of the Poor and Needy'), on the robbery of Church goods, published at Ingolstadt in the year 1577.

CHAPTER VI

POSITION OF THE EMPIRE—THE ECCLESIASTICAL
RESERVATION—THE AUGSBURG DIET OF 1559

THE Empire had indeed become ‘weak and miserable, and a laughing-stock to strangers.’

After the unity of the faith had been formally renounced by the Religious Peace of Augsburg, the universal significance of the Papacy, and with it the Holy Christian Empire in the old sense of the word, had practically ceased to be. From henceforth the territorial power of the princes asserted itself more and more strongly over the might of the Empire. Under the ægis of so-called ‘German liberty’ every species of insubordination and resistance to the supreme head of the realm was palliated and defended, and there grew up gradually that new system of polity which dismembered the Empire, transformed the reigning princes into completely independent sovereigns (tyrants, too often, over their subjects), and as it were ‘mediatised’ the nation and robbed it of its power and renown. The general affairs of the Fatherland were most shamefully neglected; the best strength of the nation was consumed in degrading theological controversy. The military commander-in-chief, Lazarus von Schwendi, said in 1570, ‘the strength of the German nation is going utterly to the ground, and the imperial power has

no longer any substance or reality in it ; it is a mere shadow.' Nine years before, in 1561, the Spanish ambassador, Count Luna, had written to Philip II. : ' In very truth things in Germany are in such evil plight, not only with respect to religion, but also as regards loyalty and obedience, that the dignity of a King of the Romans is not merely nothing much, but actually nothing at all.'¹

During the reign of Charles V., Germany had attained to greater power and glory than ever before, but after his abdication the Empire not only lost its preponderating influence, but descended from the rank of great European powers, and withdrew altogether from foreign politics.

Switzerland had already separated itself from the Empire under Maximilian I. ; under Charles V. the territory of the Teutonic knights had been converted into a Polish fief, and, through the treason of the Elector Maurice and his associates, the first partitioning of Germany had followed.² The three most important border fortresses, the chief bulwarks against France, had been lost, and Strassburg, which was the key to Alsace and the Upper Rhine, had almost fallen into the hands of the French. The French kings, themselves lusting for the imperial crown, had always placed themselves at the head of the Emperor's enemies, and in the year 1557 ' extensive intrigues on the part of France to secure the Empire ' were still apprehended on the Rhine.² The Venetian ambassador, Federigo Badoero, reported this same year that the Elector Palatine Frederic II. was actively engaged in forming a Rhenish confederacy ; he

¹ Schmidt, *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Gesch.* viii. 21, 22.

² Schumacher, i. 305.

had wanted to arrange a secret league between the Rhenish Elector and King Henry II. of France.¹

The internal conditions of the Empire were most lamentable. The Venetian ambassador, Michael Soriano, accredited to the Court of King Ferdinand, regarded Germany in 1556 as the ‘most corrupt and anarchical of States.’² William Melander wrote to a friend in Paris towards the end of 1557: ‘While strife and discord are increasing, in spite of the treaty of peace concluded at Augsburg, and while unholy schism and bitterness are dividing hearts and minds, public insecurity in trade and business is spreading most lamentably; large districts are overrun by hordes of bandits, who rob and plunder the inhabitants with impunity.’³

The town delegates assembled at the Diet of Ratisbon in 1556 complained, in a memorial presented to King Ferdinand, that, ‘in spite of the mandates of Emperor and Empire, there had been many more robberies and deeds of violent aggression on the imperial highways of late than ever before for many years past. It has come to this that in many districts no honest man is safe outside his own door; much less can he journey abroad without serious danger to life and property. Within a short space of time, numbers of merchant wagons from the Upper and Lower Netherlands, and from other dependencies of the Empire, had been overturned and plundered, and also many respectable, unoffending persons had been seized on the highways, and brutally

¹ . . . ‘è stato autore di far una lega che è tenuta segreta, tra loro elettori del Reno e S. M. Cristianissima. L’imperadore fa queste cose issimulando’ (*Alberi*, ser. 1, col. iii. 216).

² ‘Guastissimo et corruttissimo’ (Schmidt, *Neuere Gesch.* ii. 146–149).

³ *Miszellaneen gemeinnützigen Inhaltes*, pp. 72, 73.

shot or murdered. In some places whole villages and boroughs had been burnt down. Crimes so abominable,' the work, for the most part, of vagrant, disbanded *Landsknechts* (foot soldiers), 'will redound among all Christian potentates to the eternal shame of the German nation ; they are the ruin of all commerce in Germany ; they send up the prices of provisions, and cause traders and handicrafts to come to a standstill, as is evident in many places.'¹

In another memorial the town delegates said that 'The new and excessive tolls imposed on traffic both by land and water' had also a great deal to do with the falling off of trade. 'For this reason numbers of tradespeople, here and there, especially in the towns, have already given up their business and handicrafts, for they cannot afford to pay these heavy tolls and customs duties.' Commerce and industry are in danger of becoming extinct or falling into the hands of a few wealthy men ; should this happen, the towns will be ruined, and the greatest misery will befall the subjects of the Empire.² The delegates of the Lower Austrian Estates drew a gruesome picture, at this same diet, of the tyrannical behaviour of the Turks on German soil : 'The Christian people are strangled by thousands and brutally massacred ; by thousands they are carried off into captivity.'³

Meanwhile the Protestant princes represented to the King at the Diet that the most urgent matter for

¹ *In den Frankfurter Reichstagsacten*, 64^b, fol. 206–208.

² *Ibid.* 64^b, fol. 204–206. The Frankfort delegate, Anton zum Jungen, sent the Council on March 7, 1557, copies of these two memorials (fol. 292).

³ *Ibid.* 66^a, fol. 47–107. See 66^b, fol. 78–101, the motion of the Hungarian and Bohemian delegates.

imperial consideration was the removal of the ‘ Ecclesiastical Reservation ’ from among the stipulations of the Religious Peace of Augsburg ; this was a question, they said, which concerned the beloved Fatherland far more closely than any other. It had been expressly stated in the Treaty of Religious Peace that all archbishops, bishops, and prelates might, ‘ without detriment to their honour,’ go over to the Augsburg Confession ; but that they must forfeit the archbishoprics, or bishoprics, or prelacies, together with the revenues thereto appertaining, to which they had been appointed when they were Catholics.¹ This stipulation was looked upon by the Protestant princes as ‘ a snare to consciences.’ It was to be feared that any restriction on the clergy’s acceptance of the Augsburg Confession might prove a serious obstacle in any future attempts at effecting religious unity. For ‘ some honest Christians ’ might be withheld from confessing the truth from fear of losing their dignities and emoluments, and thus there would be no such thing as free and open voting for Christian reforms and reconciliation, but only timid and hampered votes. Further, ‘ it would be no slight blot and disgrace to the Protestant religion, if those who acknowledged it and who recognised the truth of the Divine Word were deposed from their administrative posts, and ecclesiastical dignities and offices, and pronounced unworthy of the clerical name and status, which, nevertheless, they could not renounce.’ If the Reservation was not removed, it would be impossible to come to any final agreement or to take any decisive action with regard to any other imperial

¹ Concerning the ‘ Ecclesiastical Reservation ’ and its significance, see our statements, vol. iii. 754 f. (German orig.); vol. vi. 495, n. 2 (Eng. transl.).

matters.¹ Duke Christopher of Würtemberg had given instructions to his delegates not to confine themselves to the question of removal of the ‘Reservation,’ but also to require that the bishops should be released from their oaths to the Pope. If ‘Christian freedom is not obtained,’ said the Duke, ‘we cannot hope for peace.’² The Protestant delegates were unremitting in their assertions that in thus insisting on emancipation their one object was ‘to set consciences free, and to promote mutual confidence among the Estates, and religious unity.’

But under these fine-sounding names the princes meant no more and no less than complete suppression of the Catholics. In a memorandum of advice against the ‘Reservation,’ Melanchthon had said as early as 1555 : ‘We cannot force on religious unity in Germany ; the only way is to wait for the power of the pure truth to attract gradually a larger and larger number of bishops, princes, and other rulers to its cause.’³ The Palatine Elector said, in a letter to the Duke of Würtemberg, that if they both persisted in demanding the abolition of the Reservation, ‘the harvest would be ready for the sickle before they had done.’⁴

But the Protestant princes met with stubborn resistance from Ferdinand, ‘who was still far too much under the influence of popish abominations and priesthood.’ He had asked the Estates for subsidies against the Turks, who were threatening another gigantic attack. The Sultan wanted not only to make himself entire master of Hungary (the possession of which was so important to the Empire), but he had also demanded

¹ Erstenberger, pp. 18^a–22.

³ *Corp. Reform.* viii. 478.

² Sattler, iv. 24 f.

⁴ Kugler, ii. 29, note.

the unconditional surrender of Transylvania ; and with this country another bulwark against the arch-enemy would be lost.¹ The help of the Estates was urgently needed ; but the King declared that he would rather forego all their assistance and calmly await the destruction of the Empire than consent to the abolition of the ‘ Reservation.’²

The Protestants, as well as the Catholics, were of opinion that Ferdinand had ‘ good and weighty reasons ’ for his decision. ‘ It is greatly to be feared,’ said the Frankfort town council on February 24, 1557, in a draft of instructions for its delegates—‘ it is greatly to be feared that the electors and princes, in making this demand, have private objects in view, which will not only be advantageous to some few ecclesiastical princes, but also in the future very profitable to their electoral and princely graces themselves, as well as to their belongings ; and it is also to be feared that they are more on the look-out for temporal things than for things eternal.’ The delegate was therefore enjoined ‘ not to press the matter too hard.’³ His own report as to the results of his mission is that ‘ neither with the King nor with the Ecclesiastical Estates was it possible to push the matter through.’⁴ The Elector Augustus of Saxony objected at first to having the question mooted at the Diet, because the article on the ‘ Reservation ’ had nothing to do with the Protestant princes,⁵ possibly also because he mistrusted the intentions of the Palatine Elector and the Duke of Würtemberg. The latter thought it necessary to defend himself in a letter to the

¹ The King’s address to the Estates, Riess, pp. 182, 183.

² Schmidt, *Neuere Geschichte*, iii. 16.

³ *Reichstagsacten*, 64^b, fol. 281. ⁴ *Ibid.* 64, fol. 292.

⁵ Ritter, *Augsburger Religionsfriede*, p. 254.

Landgrave Philip of Hesse against the representation made to the Elector Augustus that he, in conjunction with the Palatine Elector, intended seizing the bishoprics of the Empire, and delivering them over to secular hands.¹

Ferdinand was immovable. He reminded the assembly that when, at the time of the conclusion of the Religious Peace, a long and weary dispute had gone on between the Protestants and Catholics respecting the ‘Reservation,’ he had adduced many good and sufficient reasons for not depriving the Catholic clergy of the benefit of this clause, and had insisted that in accordance with the rights of the clergy, in accordance with the laws and constitution of the Holy Empire, and above all in accordance with the Treaty of Passau, this Reservation ought to be incorporated in the charter of the Religious Peace. Although the Protestants had at that time brought forward some arguments against him, the ‘Reservation,’ with other articles, had been agreed to and finally embodied among the terms of the Religious Peace, with ‘the knowledge and consent’ of the Estates of both religions. The Estates professing the Augsburg Confession had ‘not only not opposed the clause any more,’ but had even thanked the King for the peace that had been concluded more heartily than the Catholics had done. They too, as well as the Catholics, had entered in the Recess their acknowledgment that all the articles of this document had been passed with their approval, and that they would conform to them honestly and persistently. By their present demand for the abolition of the ‘Reservation,’ Ferdinand said, they were calling in question the treaty

¹ Letter of Feb. 23, 1558, in Neudecker, *Neue Beiträge*, i. 161.

of peace ‘which had been concluded with so much difficulty and trouble, and after so long and wearisome a contest, and were giving the Catholic Estates reason to think that they wanted to upset the peace altogether, and to bring matters back to their former state of confusion.’ But even should this happen, and a return be made to the position of affairs before the settlement of the peace, he, the King, would never give in to the abolition of the ‘Reservation.’¹

To this the delegates of the Protestant princes replied that the ‘Reservation’ clause had by no means been generally agreed to at Augsburg, but only inserted by command of the King. The thanks expressed by them to the King for the conclusion of the peace could not ‘be interpreted as consent to the “Reservation,” for this was not an item in the terms of the peace, and had no relation to its main substance ; on the contrary, it rather hindered reconciliation in religious matters, as by it the clergy were cut off from all Christian reform on penalty of severe punishment. They had not raised a protest at Augsburg against the incorporation of the “Reservation” clause in the charter of peace, because the words of the King, recorded there also, that on this point “the Estates of both religions had not been able to come to an agreement” showed plainly that they had not given their consent : their “oft-reiterated dissent” was sufficiently emphasised in the document itself.’²

The chief interest of the Protestant princes in thus struggling for the removal of the ‘Ecclesiastical Reservation’ was the spread of their own religion and the provision of bishoprics and benefices for their heirs and successors. The King’s concern, on the other hand, was

¹ Erstenberger, pp. 23–24, 29–30.

² *Ibid.* pp. 23–24, 29–30.

to protect the imperial power, too much enfeebled already, and not to let bishoprics and religious establishments fall a prey to temporal hereditary princes ; for the electoral princes had been, on the whole, for centuries past better supporters of the electoral throne than the hereditary princes who were always working for complete independence. At the same time Ferdinand recognised in the ‘ Ecclesiastical Reservation ’ a most important bulwark of the Catholic Church in the Empire. The occupation of archbishoprics and bishoprics by Protestants at a time when the saying held good everywhere, ‘ *Wessen das Land, dessen die Religion,* ’¹ would have been speedily followed by the Protestantisation of the territory in question ; and seeing that most of the temporal princes had embraced the new religion, the next step would have been the complete suppression of the Catholics. The King, therefore, had ‘ good and weighty reasons ’ for persisting in his opposition to the removal of the ‘ Reservation.’

On March 12 the delegates of the Protestant princes handed in a memorial to the King to the effect that they had been solemnly charged to protest and declare openly, in the name of their electors and princes, that they had never consented to the ‘ Ecclesiastical Reservation,’ and that for conscience’s sake they never could and never would consent to it. If in the future, they said, any cleric was deprived of his dignity, benefice, and office on account of refusal to accept the Augsburg Confession, they would not help in any way in proceedings against him, ‘ in like manner,’ they declared, ‘ as they had never consented to execute against the con-

¹ ‘ Whose the land, theirs the religion.’

verted clergy the stipulations of the Landfriede (measures for securing freedom from injustice and violence throughout the land) annexed to the treaty of religious and profane peace.' At the same time, they added, it was by no means their intention to call in question the Religious Treaty of Peace, or to attempt to upset it, for the 'Reservation' had nothing to do with the question of the peace, and did not lay them under any obligation to the other Estates; it belonged to the various rules and regulations framed among themselves by the clergy, and it rested on their recommendation.¹ Duke Christopher, moreover, had proposed a still more resolute mode of procedure. At a special conference of the Estates his delegate had said that if they did not succeed in obtaining either the abolition or a modification of the 'Reservation,' they ought to present themselves before the King and protest that 'if one or more among the Papists' party wished to come over to our religion, and were in consequence deprived of their benefices, dignities, and possessions, we could not on that account repel them from us, but should feel it our duty to take them under our care and protection.'

Such protection would at any rate be quite legitimate if the 'Reservation' had been entirely done away with. For then it would not only not be allowable to take part in proceedings based on such a clause, but it would be a duty to try to prevent what would be an act of injustice, and also to take the side of the parties on whom the injustice fell. But the rest of the Estates had not been willing to go to such lengths

¹ Erstenberger, pp. 30^b-32.

as this, and so the Würtemberg resolution was not passed.¹

In spite, however, of the protest entered on March 12, the Treaty of Religious Peace was confirmed in its entirety in the (Recess) on March 16. Ferdinand's son, King Maximilian of Bohemia, wrote to Christopher of Würtemberg on April 13 that he had expected that his father would have been more yielding in the matter of the 'Reservation.' 'I cannot imagine,' he said, 'who the people can have been who have hindered such a work; but they will receive their due reward.'² Maximilian comforted the Duke with the remark: 'Who knows but that everything may be changed again? '³

And indeed it did soon appear to the Protestant princes as if there were a prospect of Ferdinand's changing his mind.

After Charles V. had renounced the imperial throne and title, the electors met together at Frankfort and summoned thither King Ferdinand, who on March 14, 1558, swore, as Emperor of the Romans, to keep firmly and faithfully the Religious Peace, and the public peace, and all the statutes and ordinances of the Augsburg Recess of 1555, and never on their account to oppress any one himself, or allow any one to be oppressed by others. Ferdinand set himself most strongly against the pretension of the Protestant electors that the Emperor in his coronation oath ought no longer to pledge himself 'to take under his suzerain care, protection, and guardianship, Christendom and the see of

¹ Ritter, *Augsburger Religionsfriede*, pp. 254-258.

² Le Bret, ix. 85.

³ Pfister, *Herzog Christoph*, i. 336.

Rome, with his Holiness the Pope and the Christian Church,' and he succeeded, though not without difficulty, in keeping intact the ancient form of oath. But as Charles V. had abdicated without the consent of the apostolic see, and Ferdinand had assumed the imperial dignity also without the consent of Rome, a fierce quarrel broke out on the subject with the Pope Paul IV.¹

Clinging firmly to the mediæval idea of the Empire, Paul declared that without the sanction of the Pope an emperor could not resign his dignity, and the electors could not accept such a resignation, or proceed to a new election. He (Paul) could not confirm an election which was null and void ; but he could cancel the election and then himself appoint the selected candidate, in consideration of his good qualities and services. The election, he said, was null and void for another reason, viz. that avowed heretics and apostates had had a share in it. At a consistory of the Cardinals, so report said, the Pope spoke quite passionately, and said that Charles V. could not have been in possession of his reason when he acted as having the plenary power of resignation. On the other hand, the Imperial Vice-Chancellor Seld, in a memorandum drawn up at Ferdinand's request, said the Pope was so furious that many people thought that age and other circum-

¹ What the Protestants thought of the election of Ferdinand is shown by a letter of Peter Martyr to Calvin on April 21, 1558 : ‘Inauguratio novi Imperatoris forma et ratione insolita et hactenus inaudita omnibus admirationem incredibilem peperit. Hac enim (ut loquuntur) coronatione *Antichristi Romani auctoritas videtur disjecta, plus quam hactenus unquam fuerit* : et quo pacto electores archiepiscopi adduci potuerint, ut eiusmodi consenserint inaugurationi, nullus propemodum intelligit’ (*Calvini Opp.* xvii. 144).

stances must have robbed him of his senses.¹ The contest was still in full swing when the Emperor Ferdinand summoned the Estates to a Diet at Augsburg on January 1, 1559. ‘Now that Emperor and Pope were so fiercely at strife,’ there was more hope, so the Protestants thought, of obtaining from the Emperor freedom of action for the clergy.²

While the princes were absorbed in discussing the ‘Ecclesiastical Reservation,’ which they regarded as the most important question of the day, the one which ‘most closely concerned the beloved Fatherland,’ French and Russians were burning and plundering, unchecked, on German soil. At the Augsburg Diet, Bishop Rupert of Liège handed in to the Emperor and the notables a statement, describing the acts of violence perpetrated by the French in his diocese. ‘If measures of prevention were not taken, he said, the whole of the bishopric would be lost to the Empire, as had been the case with the bishoprics of Lorraine. If France once got possession of the diocese of Liège, she would have easy access to other territories.’³ A similar complaint was made by the expelled ‘Regents and burghers of the town of Metz,’ of the ‘treacherous, tyrannical, and cruel behaviour’ of the French. ‘This city, so beautiful and flourishing, so far-famed and orderly of yore,’ was now in a most piteous condition, and reduced to a state of intolerable servitude. From 1400 to 1500

¹ Fuller details concerning the ‘Quarrel between the Papacy and the Empire’ in E. Reimann’s article in the *Forschungen zur deutschen Gesch.* v. 291–335, and in the admirable pages of J. Schmid in the *Hist. Jahrb.* vi. 5 ff., the result of comprehensive study in Roman libraries.

² The Diet was opened on March 3, 1559. See Wolf, *Zur Gesch. der deutschen Protestantten*, p. 162.

³ Frankfort *Reichstagsacten*, 69, fol. 54–56. See Häberlin, iv. 118–119.

houses had been pulled down to furnish materials for the fortification of the town, six cloisters demolished, and unheard-of brutality perpetrated against the inhabitants. Among other enormities was the case of a Franciscan monk, who was accused of complicity with the Emperor and was tortured to death on the rack, and afterwards hung up in a public place. Whereas all their complaints to the Emperor and the Empire had proved fruitless, the citizens now begged that the Estates would come to the rescue of this oppressed and ruined town.¹

These complaints of the Bishop of Liège and the burghers of Metz were read out to the notables on March 30, 1559, and the Emperor Ferdinand insisted that the matter should be dealt with seriously, in order ‘at last to show that the Holy Empire would not for ever suffer loss, insults, and persecution to go unpunished.’

Shortly before, during the transactions connected with the treaty of peace, concluded at Château-Cambresis between France, Spain, and England, the Emperor had endeavoured to bring the French to renounce the Lotharingian towns and bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun, which had come into their possession through the treachery of the princes in 1552.² His endeavours, however, had failed, and now, by the Emperor’s wish, the Imperial Estates were to take ‘this highly important matter in hand and insist on the restoration of the territories unjustly wrested from the Empire.’ The French King, Henry II., had sent two ambassadors

¹ Frankfort *Reichstagsacten*, 69, fol. 57–67.

² Report in Kluckhohn, *Letters*, i. 57. Concerning this treachery in the year 1552, see our statement, iii. 682 ff.

to the Diet, with instructions to express his feelings of ‘especial love and favour’ towards Germany, and to promise his friendship and support. ‘On the way to Augsburg,’ so ran the King’s instructions, ‘the ambassadors were to convey his thanks to the Count Palatine, the Duke of Würtemberg, the Landgrave of Hesse, and Duke John Frederic of Saxony, for the help and friendship which they had shown of late years to the French crown; they were to promise all these princes the King’s best services for the advancement of their houses.’ If the Estates at Augsburg, at Ferdinand’s suggestion, should demand the restoration of the bishoprics, they were to answer that they had no power over them, but that they did not doubt that if the Emperor applied to the King himself, he would gain the assurance of Henry’s good intentions with regard to the freedom and greatness of the Empire.¹

‘French palaver of this sort was well known in the Empire of old,’ but on this occasion also there were many among the princes ‘on whom it produced a favourable impression, and to whom it afforded a pretext for saying that it would not be wise to offend the King of France.’ The Palatine Elector was especially anxious that the King’s ‘proffered friendship should not be rejected, but gratefully accepted, that, with regard to the restitution of the bishoprics, everything should be done as pleasantly as possible, and that the French

¹ Ribier, ii. 785. See Barthold, *Deutschland und die Hugenotten*, i. 264–265; and Heidenhain, *Beiträge*, pp. 70, 141. The French King directed his envoys to apply constantly for advice and help to the ‘many princes, lords, generals, and captains who were his pensioners, and for whom he gave them sums of money.’ They were also to grant pensions of 200 thalers each to councillors and servants of the princes. Raumer, *Letters from Paris*, i. 33.

ambassadors should be dismissed with friendly assurances.'¹

The ambassadors reported to Paris that there was nothing to fear from Germany. The condition of the Empire was such that it had enough to do to look after its own preservation, without thinking of foreign undertakings. ‘The slowness of the Germans, the confusion in their deliberations, the lengthiness of their diets will give us time to put Metz and the other conquered towns in such a state of defence as to preclude all fear of Germany’s winning them back again.’²

After lengthy debates the Estates agreed to send a special embassy to France to treat with Henry II. for the restoration of the territory wrested from Germany, ‘so that the power and reputation of the Holy Empire might be sustained.’ Two persons, if possible of princely rank, one of them a Catholic and the other an Augsburg Confessionist, were to be selected. The choice fell on Duke Christopher of Würtemberg and the Cardinal Bishop Otto of Augsburg. But the Duke refused to travel with the Cardinal, and wished to be accompanied by Duke Albert of Bavaria. The latter, however, made difficulties. He said that in the present unsettled state of affairs he could not undertake so long a journey unless he had full security from the Emperor and the Estates that in case of any disturbance or insurrection breaking out in the Empire during his absence, ‘his wife and children, as well as his lands and people, would be taken under the protection of the Emperor and the Estates.’³ Albert

¹ Frederic’s instructions for his ambassadors, in Kluckhohn, *Letters*, i. 50, 58, 60. See Heidenhain, *Beiträge*, pp. 71, 74.

² Raumer, *Letters*, i. 34.

³ Frankfort *Reichstagsacten*, 67, fol. 139.

moreover demanded 12,000 florins a month for his travelling expenses, whereas the Estates would not even vote him 4,000.¹ ‘So that again there was nothing but unpleasantness.’ ‘I greatly fear,’ wrote the Frankfort delegate, Daniel zum Jungen, on May 29, ‘that this preposterous behaviour of Germany will excite a good deal of laughter in France and elsewhere.’ On July 4 he wrote further: ‘This embassy is a troublesome business, which will cost an immense deal of money and lead to great difficulties on account of the indemnity, and it might just as well be given up as proceeded with.’²

When, finally, after the death of Henry II., Louis Madruzzi, Bishop of Trent, and Louis Count zu Stolberg and Königstein, were sent as ambassadors to the new King, Francis II., Duke Christopher and Wolfgang, the Count Palatine of Zweibrücken, were full of anxiety as to ‘what intrigues they would carry on while in France.’³ The ambassadors were received with due solemnity by Francis II. and magnificently entertained. Francis conveyed to them the assurance that he was delighted at their arrival because they had been sent as friends by friends to his Royal Majesty, who was their great friend. He also allowed that the bishoprics and towns of Lorraine belonged to the Empire, and that the Empire on the other hand had not taken possession of any land that belonged to France.⁴ Nevertheless, he added, he could not at

¹ Schmidt, *Neuere Geschichte*, iii. 97; Bucholtz, vii. 135; Heidenhain, *Beiträge*, pp. 80, 147 f.

² Frankfort *Reichstagsacten*, 67, fol. 44^b, 63.

³ Kugler, ii. 186, note.

⁴ ‘. . . Libenter etiam agnoscit, sacrum Germanicæ nationis imperium nihil unquam antea nostra memoria quiequam quod esset Gallicorum finium occupasse.’

present consent to the restoration of the towns and bishoprics; but so as not to awaken any unfriendly feelings against himself in the hearts of the German people, he would wait till the next Diet, when he would lay his claims and rights before the assembly.¹

‘And so, in very truth, the whole business was absurd and disgraceful, and the Holy Empire stood by in helpless impotence.’²

Through the outbreak of the French wars of religion the Empire was saved for the present from further losses to France; but from its soil both the leaders of the French politico-religious revolution and their base and dishonourable opponents drew their support. The contest was waged on both sides by means of German mercenaries.

But it was not against France alone that the Empire stood in helpless impotence; it was in danger also of forfeiting the rest of its possessions in Russia and Scandinavia.

With the help of strategists of German, Polish, and Italian nationality, Ivan the Terrible had created an army on the pattern of the armies of Western Europe; it consisted of 60,000 men ready to take the field. His large collection of artillery, cast from the finest metal, and stored in the arsenal at Moscow, excited the admiration of an ambassador of Queen

¹ Reports of the ambassadors and several of the articles relating to the embassy in the *Zeitschrift für preussische Gesch. und Landeskunde*, Jahrgang 10 (Berlin, 1873), pp. 337–354. See Bucholtz, vii. 463 ff.; Barthold, i. 310–312; and Heidenhain, *Beiträge*, p. 81.

² Barthold says, i. 312: ‘As the decline of power, unity, and loyalty in the land unfortunately rendered an imperial war impossible, the “solemn and imposing embassy” became a subject of ridicule.’

Elizabeth of England.¹ In 1552, amid appalling bloodshed, Ivan had overthrown the empire of the Mongolian Chans in Kasan, and two years later he had conquered Astrachan on the Caspian Sea and the whole of Cabardey as far as to the Caucasus. He had next attempted to subjugate Livonia and to gain dominion over the Baltic Sea. The Moscovite theologians told the people that the prophecy of St. John the Evangelist concerning the sixth Czar was now fulfilled, and that the Czar Ivan occupied the highest place among the princes of the earth. In a despatch to the Sultan, Ivan once called himself 'Emperor of the Germans.' Russia had become a Christian kaliphate, and the Czar supreme lord both over the faith and over the lives and property of his subjects.

In the time of Charles V. the *Heermeister* (provincial master) of the Teutonic knights had already warned the Emperor and the Estates against the Czar. 'If this Moscovite,' he had said, 'conquers Livonia and thereby gets possession of the Baltic, he will not be long in bringing the adjacent lands also—Lithuania, Poland, Prussia, and Sweden—under his dominion.'² But how was the Czar to be resisted? 'The poor anarchical Holy Empire was powerless,' and the Teutonic knights were given up to pleasure and ostentation. 'The whole business and occupation of the Teutonic knights, the canons, and the nobles,' said the chronicler Rüssow, 'consists in hunting, gambling, riding, and driving.'³

In 1557 a feud had broken out between the Arch-

¹ Hermann, *Gesch. des russischen Staates*, iii. 354.

² Karamsin, *Geschichte des russischen Reiches* (German translation Riga, 1825), vii. 478, note 269.

³ *Chronika der Provinz Lyffland* (Barth, 1584), p. 32^o.

bishop of Riga (Margrave William of Brandenburg),¹ who had secretly turned Protestant, and the Teutonic Order, because the archbishop, in defiance of the resolution of a provincial diet that no foreign prince should be admitted to the archiepiscopate, had appointed Duke Christopher of Mecklenburg, a Protestant, to be his coadjutor ; and this, as reproach said, ‘in order to give the finishing stroke to Livonia.’ The archbishop, with his coadjutor, was taken prisoner, and he turned for help to King Sigismund Augustus of Poland. Sigismund, as ‘ hereditary guardian of the archbishopric,’ sent such overwhelming forces against the Livonian frontier, that the knights of the Order were completely cowed and thought it advisable to reinstate the archbishop and his coadjutor, and to conclude an offensive and defensive alliance with the Polish crown. Ivan, who in 1554 had already assumed the title of ‘ Lord of Livonia,’² made this alliance a pretext for invading the territory of the Teutonic Order, and in July 1558 he was in possession of Narwa, Wesenberg, Neuhausen, and Dorpat. By his orders the Archbishop of Novgorod was compelled to ‘ cleanse the town of Narwa from the Catholic and the Lutheran religions.’ By force of arms the ‘ holy orthodox Russian faith ’ was established throughout Livonia ; the Lutheran churches were burnt ; the Catholics and the Jews were drowned. Gotthard von Ketteler, who, as coadjutor of the Grand Master, acted since July 1558 as the head of the Order, applied to the Kings of Sweden and Denmark for help against Russia, and as ‘ a member of the Holy Empire ’ admonished the Estates assembled at Augsburg of

¹ See our statements, vi. 46–47.

² Schlözer, *Verfall*, p. 153.

their duties towards Livonia. In the draft of instructions which Archbishop William of Brandenburg sent to his delegate to Augsburg, it was stated that ‘The Russians have perpetrated all sorts of inhuman tyranny and brutality ; they have not even spared the bodies of the dead, which should be left at rest in God ; they have driven away into perpetual servitude young men and old men, women and children ; they have barbarously dishonoured young women and honourable matrons ; they have burnt down villages in all directions, devastated whole tracts of land, robbed the poor people of their goods and chattels, and inhumanly massacred poor little innocent children, who, most piteous to relate, were hacked in pieces by these monsters.’¹

‘There was much to talk about then in Augsburg ; how terrible was the might of these Moscovites, and what a murderous, gruesome Lord, whose chief delight was in roasting, hanging, and spearing the people, stood at the head of the Empire ;’ but ‘for the German brethren, who were crying for help against the Moscovites, nothing could be done.’ The Imperial Estates moved a resolution that the Emperor should write and request the Czar to desist from warfare, to restore what he had taken by force, and to abstain thenceforth from molesting the Estates of Livonia by hostile proceedings. In order that the Livonian Estates should be made to realise what true and deep compassion was felt for them in the Empire, it was proposed that the sum of 100,000 florins should be raised as a relief fund for their benefit in case of need. The towns of Hamburg and Lübeck were asked to advance this sum without requiring any interest on their loans.

¹ *Monumenta Livoniæ*, v. 562–563.

The Estates promised to contribute their quota, not at once, but by St. John's day in the following year. The two towns, however, refused to make the loan; the Estates sent no contributions, and the Livonians did not receive a farthing of the 'benevolent fund.'¹

Cheated thus of any help from the Empire, there remained no better prospect for the territory of the Order than to be the prize of victory in a campaign between Russia, Poland, Sweden, and Denmark.

The interest felt by the Estates in the general affairs of the Fatherland, in the welfare and repute of the Empire, had fallen to so low an ebb that the Elector Palatine, Frederic III. for instance, regarded the Livonian business as a 'foreign concern,' and instructed his delegates to use all their efforts to oppose the sending of imperial help, in order that the Empire might not be constantly involved in fresh foreign affairs.²

The Czar resumed his plundering raids in the summer of 1559, and the Northern Estates, Brandenburg especially, apprehended that 'if once Livonia were conquered by the Moscovites, the latter would prove as dangerous an enemy in the north as the Turks were in the south.' Again and again the question was raised of sending troops to Livonia, and supplies of money for the Order, but nothing practical was done. An ambassador, sent by the Emperor to Moscow, came back without having effected anything. While Estonia fell under the dominion of Sweden, the Livonians, on November 28, 1561, surrendered themselves to King Sigismund Augustus of Poland, 'because,' said

¹ *Aufzeichnung von 1560; Kriegsnöthen in Livland*, fol. 2-3; Häberlin, iv. 136-138.

² Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 65.

they, ‘the poor nobles and all the other inhabitants of the land were not only abandoned by the Emperor and all the Estates, and left a prey to the unequalled ferocity, incendiaryism, robbery, devastation and slaughter of the Russians, but were also hostilely attacked by others who ought to come to their help and rescue.’ The provincial master, Gotthard von Ketteler, followed the example of Duke Albert of Prussia. He was invested, as a Polish vassal, with the hereditary ducal dignity over Curland and Semgall, and he delivered up the mantle and cross of his Order, and the imperial and royal charters and letters patent to the King of Poland. The latter promised on his part to protect the Augsburg Confession in Livonia, to bestow an independent constitution on the land, and to insure that its submission to Poland should not bring on it any trouble or vexation from the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation.¹

Thus Livonia was lost to the Teutonic Order, to the Catholic Church, and to the German Empire, ‘and what will still further be cut off from the Holy Empire,’ we read in the letter of a patriotic jurist of 1552, ‘future historians will have to relate, if the crippled condition and the decay of the Empire, the quarrels and dissensions about religion and faith go on in the future as they have done hitherto.’²

When it was realised at the Augsburg Diet that the Emperor’s hereditary lands protected the Empire on the East against the arch-enemy, the Sultan, and

¹ Concerning Gotthard von Ketteler, see the article of J. S. Seibertz in the *Zeitschrift für vaterländische Gesch. und Alterthumskunde*, 29 (Münster, 1871), Heft ii.

² *Miszellanen gemeinnützigen Inhaltes*, 93 ('Miscellanies of public interest').

that Ferdinand must consequently not be left in the lurch, some of the Estates were eager to be more generous even in their Turkish subsidies than they had shown themselves in their promises to Livonia. But nobody responded to the Emperor's demand for 'continuous help throughout the campaign,'¹ which he coupled with the assurance that he meant to send two of his sons into the field, and that he would gladly risk 'his own old bones.' Duke Christopher of Würtemberg was anxious that pecuniary help should be given to the Emperor out of the property of the Teutonic Knights, the Knights of St. John, the monasteries, convents, and bishoprics; the Jews also, he thought, should pay tribute.² The Elector Palatine Frederic III. belonged, as he wrote to his son-in-law, Duke John Frederic of Saxony, to the number of those Estates 'who knew how to give nothing.'³ He did not consider the Turkish business an imperial affair. If the House of Austria, he said, had not annexed Hungary, Germany would have been saved the expense of war against Turkey. And yet it was only by means of Hungary that Germany could be secured against further Turkish invasions, and against subjugation to the Ottoman yoke. Owing, however, to a rumour current during the transactions that there was hope of an armistice with the Turks, the only decision recorded in the imperial Recess was that the money which had before been voted at Ratisbon, but not yet been sent in, should now be supplied to the Emperor for the building and maintenance of Hungarian border fortresses, and that

¹ Despatch of the Frankfort delegate, Daniel zum Jungen, of March 6, 1559, in the *Reichstagsacten*, 67, fol. 1-3.

² Häberlin, iv. 51.

³ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 88.

the sum of 500,000 florins should be paid by the Estates for the maintenance of the garrisons during the next three years. ‘No attempt at recovery of the territories conquered by the Turks could be thought of under the melancholy circumstances of dissension, mistrust, and schism which prevailed among the Estates.’

‘The interminable division of Germany,’ wrote the Venetian Michael Soriano in 1556, ‘is most marked between the Catholic and Protestant Estates, each party believing the other to be bent on its destruction.’ Duke Albert of Bavaria complained in the same year that the Palatinate and Baden were making dangerous preparations. Albert, on the other hand, was accused of plotting the establishment of a ‘popish and clerical league’ with a view to an attack on the Estates professing the Augsburg Confession.¹ Ferdinand himself came under suspicion of intending to surprise the Augsburg Confessionists with the forces he was nominally equipping for resistance against the Turks.

‘It astonishes me,’ said the imperial councillor Zasius in the year 1557 to Christopher of Würtemberg, ‘that any one with a spark of human reason left should entertain such an idea. That there are malignant, mischievous people in plenty, always attempting to hinder and overthrow whatever tends to peace, I know full well from everyday experience. But what distresses me most grievously is that wicked and false insinuations and calumnies, no matter how base and groundless they be, should meet with credence. Could there be a more unjust and ridiculous notion than that Ferdinand would dream of creating disturbance in the Empire, when no one would suffer more from such a

¹ Kugler, ii. 3.

calamity than he himself and his children ? How he can ever be in a position to take such a step, and what advantage it would be to him, even were he admirably equipped, with such redoubtable neighbours in Hungary, even a child of seven years old might be able to estimate. What cause has Ferdinand ever given any imperial Estate during his whole reign to mistrust his faithfulness to the Religious Peace, signed and sealed with his name ? ' In short,' Zasius concludes, ' if the Almighty does not intervene to produce a change in men's minds, I see clearly that all will go to rack and ruin, for nobody is of any account save those wicked agitators who, day and night, devote all their energies to hastening on this catastrophe.'¹

At the instigation of Ferdinand, the Landsberg League was formed in the year 1556. This was a defensive alliance of Catholics and Protestants for the maintenance of public tranquillity, and for mutual defence, formed between the Emperor, the Duke of Bavaria, the Archbishop of Saltzburg, and the town of Augsburg. In the following year it was enlarged by the admission of the Bishops of Bamberg and Würzburg. On the Protestant side it was also joined by the town of Nuremberg. Ferdinand made strenuous exertions to win over to this League the 'higher Estates also belonging to the Augsburg Confession,' notably Christopher von Württemberg, and the Electors Augustus of Saxony and Joachim of Brandenburg ; but he was quite unsuccessful. Duke Christopher and the Landgrave Philip of Hesse advised the Elector Augustus most urgently not to ally himself with the Emperor and with the Catholic Estates. A league with Papists,

¹ Schmidt, *Neuere Geschichte*, iii. 30-34.

Christopher said, was ‘not only dangerous, but reprehensible before God and conscience.’ He quoted the saying in the Bible that we must not ‘help the ungodly’ and ‘join hands with those whom God hates.’ If the Elector Augustus joined the League of Landsberg he would substantiate the outcry raised against him of ‘whoredom with the Antichrist.’¹

During the sitting of the Diet at Augsburg ‘the air was full of rumours of all sorts concerning attacks by the Catholics on the Augsburg Confessionists.’ In 1558, on the day of the Emperor’s election at Frankfurt on the Main, the electors of both religious parties had mutually pledged themselves, and solemnly sworn to uphold the Augsburg treaty of peace, to cherish no ill-will against each other on account of religion, but contrariwise to treat each other with all friendliness, and to come to each other’s help in case any of their number were subjected to aggression, in spite of the peace in matters spiritual and temporal that had been concluded. And now it was affirmed that ‘the “parsons” had borrowed money for warlike preparations, and that after France and Spain had become reconciled by the treaty of peace at Château-Cambrésis all their plans tended to the extermination of the evangelical teaching in four wars.’ ‘The whole greasy lot of them and all their followers,’ wrote Christopher of Würtemberg in

¹ Despatch in Neudecker, *Neue Beiträge*, i. 222–233; Sattler, p. 4; Beil, pp. 161–162; Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 141–144. Concerning the Landsberg League and its extension, see Maurenbrecher, pp. 34–36, 64–67, 78–83, and Mayer, *Leben, kleinere Werke und Briefwechsel des Dr. Wiguleus Hunot*, a contribution to the history of Bavaria in the sixteenth century (Innsbruck, 1892), p. 46 f. See also Götz, *Albrecht V.* 126 f. For a criticism of the pamphlet of Mayer, see Schlecht in the *Hist. Jahrb.* xiii. 904 f.

May 1559, ‘mean no good; we must keep our eyes open.’¹

Eberhard von der Thann, Duke John Frederic’s ambassador, declared at the Diet that ‘the Pope and all his party were the hugest, bitterest, fiercest enemies of the Augsburg Confessionists, and that all the cardinals, bishops, and clergy were bound to the Pope by the most terrible and abominable oaths.’ After such insulting attacks, the Catholics refused to take any further part in the transactions of the Diet until ‘this matter should have been settled.’ The Frankfort delegate, Daniel zum Jungen, expressed his fears that there would be ‘fresh turmoil in Germany,’ for the Duke of Saxony’s delegate, on being remonstrated with by the Emperor, had retorted that everything he had said was in accordance with the instructions given him, and ‘better still will follow.’² In a written address to the Protestant Estates, the Catholics begged them to consider how essential it was to the Empire, more especially in these troublous times, to maintain internal peace and unity, and how disastrous to the welfare of Germany were such false and hostile imputations, such offensive, injurious accusations as Eberhard von der Thann had made. It would be well, for the sake of mutual confidence and goodwill among the Estates, if the Protestants would prevent any more such proceedings in future.³ The Protestant Estates expressed their disapproval of the ‘violent language’ of the Saxon delegate, and the latter was severely reprimanded by the Emperor in full assembly of the Diet.⁴

¹ Kugler, ii. 104–105. ² Frankfort *Reichstagsacten*, 67, fol. 58, 62.

³ Frankfort *Reichstagsacten*, 67, fol. 136.

⁴ Schmidt, *Neuere Gesch.* iii. 92.

Nevertheless, ‘almost all the sessions on religious matters displayed the same stormy character, and the two parties were in a constant state of mutual embitterment.’ They wrangled and quarrelled as to which party was to blame for the break up of the Worms conference; they indulged in mutual recriminations as to violation of the Religious Peace, and wasted endless time in discussing whether another religious conference, or a national assembly, or a Council would be the best means of healing the schism in the faith. The Elector Palatine Frederic III. had sent instructions to his delegate on March 7 to declare uncompromisingly to the Emperor and the Papists, that consent could not be given to any further religious colloquy concerning reconciliation; and also that neither a national council nor an imperial assembly would be of the slightest use in the matter. ‘Even should the Pope, against his own will and inclination, consent to summon a general or a national council, it would not bring them any further; for, seeing that His Holiness himself would insist on being judge, the Protestants would have nothing to hope for from his antichristian, hellish mouth than condemnation of the true Christian religion, and execrable blasphemy such as, seven years before, Pope Paul III., with his diabolical crew of cardinals, bishops, monks, and parsons, had been guilty of at Trent.’ ‘For the Augsburg Confessionists were fully resolved in future not to let themselves be drawn into any discussion or transaction concerning religion with the opposite party; they had no intention of renouncing their creed, nor of altering the doctrine contained in it; they persisting in rejecting and condemning all teaching opposed to

it.'¹ When the Emperor, convinced by the failure of the Worms conference of the uselessness of any more such assemblies, had agreed with the Catholic Estates, both lay and clerical, that a Council was the best means for restoring unity, the Protestants renewed their former stipulations and declared that they could only recognise such a Council on condition, first, that it was not convoked by the Pope, but that the Pope, after releasing the bishops from their oaths, should himself be subject to the Council; secondly, that all decisions were made solely in accordance with the Word of God; thirdly, that the Augsburg Confessionists should have decisive votes at the Council, and that no mere majority of votes was to decide questions; fourth, that beforehand all the decrees of the Council of Trent should be declared null and void.²

Thus it now became 'patent to every one, as indeed it had long been to men of insight, that no sort of reconciliation was possible with the Estates who had separated from the Catholic religion, especially as these separatists were in all matters of faith deeply divided and always quarrelling among themselves.'

'Moreover such bitter, angry talk went on at Augsburg respecting the council, and even at convivial parties there was often so much wrangling and abuse, that the Emperor thought it best to give up the idea altogether.'³ The resolution proposed by Ferdinand was registered in the Recess: 'Transactions concerning religion are postponed till another and a better opportunity.'

As at the Diet of Ratisbon, so too now, the Protes-

¹ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 15–19.

² Planck, *Anecdota ad hist. Concilii Trident.* fasc. 25.

³ *Von Reichshandlungen zu Augsburg*, 1559 and 1566 (from the contemporary archives of the Electorate of Mayence), fol. 7.

tant princes directed their chief energies towards the removal of the Ecclesiastical Reservation; but they were mistaken in hoping that the Emperor would be more ready to accede to their wishes on account of his quarrel with the Pope.

Among other arguments brought forward by Duke Christopher of Würtemberg against the Reservation were ‘the great and undeniable abuses in the teaching and lives of the clergy, and the monstrous and indefensible anomaly that a prelate who fulfilled the duties of his office in a Christian manner, and fed his sheep with the Word of God, should be forcibly deprived of his post; and that the sheep should not only have their own shepherd taken from them, but should have another, whose teaching and life were at variance with God’s Word, imposed upon them.’¹ In the Duke’s estimation, every prelate who renounced his Catholic faith was a Christian shepherd, and it was the duty of the sheep either to conform unquestioningly to his new faith, when he set to work ‘in whatever way seemed best to him, to reform his bishopric and principality and to abolish the abuses in the teaching and practices of the Church,’ or else to avail themselves of the privilege accorded them in the Augsburg treaty of peace, and to leave the country.

The Elector Palatine Frederic III. not only insisted on the removal of the Reservation, but also demanded that explanation should be given as to how the Augsburg Religious Peace would affect the people. He said that at the special conference of the Protestant Estates, which was to take place on May 1, in addition to strenuous insistence on the emancipation of

¹ Kugler, ii. 125-126, note.

the clerical Estates, ‘the poor people must not be forgotten,’ for very scant provision for them had been made in the Augsburg treaty ; and they were entitled to as much consideration as were great personages, princes, and lords.¹ Freedom of religion must be accorded to subjects as well as to princes and rulers, but at the same time it must be understood that this statement applied only to the subjects of Catholic princes when they wished to go over to the Augsburg Confession, and not to Protestants who might wish to adopt the Catholic faith. Such, according to Frederic, was the sense in which the Emperor should be asked for an ‘explanation’ of the Religious Peace.

In a draft of instructions which had been drawn up by Otto Henry, and which was used by his successor Frederic for his delegate, it was expressly stated with regard to ‘emancipation’ that this must not be understood to mean that ‘our subjects, and the subjects of the other princes professing the Augsburg Confession, were to be free if they liked to return to the popish religion.’ Such a concession as this could not be made to any Protestant subject ; ‘therefore it is our desire that it should herewith be made clear to you, that you are not to act in such a way that the doors may be thrown wide open either to our own subjects or to those of other princes of the same faith as ours, and opportunity given them for such dangerous apostasy.’

As his reason for insisting on this course, the Elector stated : ‘And this we do decree and insist on because it is known to us that our religion is the right and true one, and that we rulers are not justified in allowing our subjects to depart from it.’²

¹ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 93.

² *Ibid.* i. 21–22, note.

‘The consciences of my subjects are mine :’ such was the epigrammatic manner in which Frederic summed up his full-fledged Cæsaropapism, and justified to his conscience any amount of violence in controlling the faith of his subjects.

‘Tyranny over consciences’ was a phrase only used by Protestants when Catholic princes, in accordance with the right granted them in the Religious Peace, endeavoured to maintain the unity of the Catholic faith in their own dominions, and would not allow the exercise of the new religion side by side with the old one. But when the Protestants, on their side, were minded to lay down the law in matters of religion, ‘tyranny over consciences’ was by no means a suitable expression.

At the instigation of the Elector Palatine the Protestant princes and counts present at the Diet, as well as their delegates, resolved to petition the Emperor once more for the removal of the Ecclesiastical Reservation. The delegates of the Elector of Saxony alone received orders not to take any part in this proceeding. But a very large majority of the Protestant town delegates were also unwilling to join the princes and counts in presenting this petition ; and consequently, as the Frankfort delegate reported home, they were forced to listen to angry words on the subject. By order of the princes, Count Valentine von Esbach, councillor of the Elector Palatine, assured them that ‘the plan proposed would best serve the cause of the Gospel ; either the towns did not understand the matter or else their intentions were not Christian ; their refusal to agree to the proposal would bring great discredit on the Augsburg Confessionists and sadly prejudice the

Emperor and the Catholic princes against them ; it would appear as if they could not succeed in being united either in religion or in other matters.' The princes did not know whether the towns were actuated 'by gingerly or by peppery motives' (=whether cautiousness or ill-will guided them). The town delegates were invited to meet in the hostel of the Elector Palatine, when the address drawn up by the higher Estates would be read out to them. They found present there, besides the Count Palatine, the councillors of the Elector of Brandenburg and a few other princes, but not the councillors of the Elector of Saxony, who, according to the instructions given them, had notified that they intended standing by the Religious Peace in the first transaction. All manner of arguments and methods of persuasion were employed to obtain the signatures of the town delegates ; but the address itself was not read to them in spite of the promise that had been given them. Some of them said that they were awaiting instructions from their chiefs ; others that they intended asking for instructions. The Augsburg delegate altogether refused to sign, and others said they wished first to hear the address.¹ Augsburg had refused to sign because the town had secured itself against any aggression by a treaty with the bishop ; Nuremberg because 'it had got rid of the Papacy out of its territory.' Ratisbon, Strassburg, Schweinfurt, and Eisenach were the only towns which gave their consent to the address.² It was then sent in to the Emperor. It contained the grossest insults against

¹ Report of Daniel zum Jungen, dated May 13, 1559, in the *Reichstagssachen*, 67, fol. 33-36.

² Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 66-67.

the Emperor and the Catholic Estates. ‘It is not right or fitting,’ so the document ran, ‘that any ruler, whatever his rank or dignity, should presume to bind men’s consciences, still less to withhold them from accepting the true religion by threats of punishment, and to force them into idolatry and false belief.’ Whereas, by the refusal to remove the Reservation, ‘the honour of God’s name has been impugned, and the true unfalsified religion imperilled, the anger of the Almighty will wax ever stronger and fiercer against the German nation; and, indeed, we may already discern the wrath and vengeance of God in the tyrannical inroads and brutal ferocity of our hereditary enemy’ (the French). What they, the Estates professing the true religion, demanded, was essentially for the highest good of the other party, for ‘the clergy were bound hand and foot by the many ties and duties which made the Pope’s interests their own, and in all religious transactions they were obliged to vote against their consciences.’¹

A more bitter attack on the honour of the Emperor and the Catholic princes than was contained in this address cannot well be imagined. But the Catholics were used to such treatment. The Ecclesiastical Estates protested against the scandalous statement that people were led into idolatry and unbelief by the Catholic teaching, and against the calumnious charge that in religious questions they were cowed into voting against their consciences.² The Emperor calmly answered that in his opinion this new dispute struck well-nigh at the entire substance of the Catholic faith. He had remained steadfast in this religion, which was the one he had been born and bred in, which he had received

¹ Erstenberger, pp. 33^b-37.

² Bucholtz, vii. 449.

from his pious parents and forefathers ; and not from them only, but from long generations also of his predecessors on the imperial throne, under whom the German nation had always continued in great glory, reputation and prosperity, and also in Christian discipline, godliness, and unity of faith. In this same religion he intended to persevere until his death, in spite of all trouble and annoyance that might befall him in consequence. He would never give up the Ecclesiastical Reservation, for he would never allow that his own religion was a false and idolatrous one, calculated to upset all Christian reform and unity, all welfare, and all salvation. Seeing that the Reservation did not concern the princes of the Augsburg Confession, as they themselves allowed, and that it did not rest on their responsibility, but that it concerned the Catholics only, it seemed to him that they might cease troubling themselves about the matter and leave it entirely to him, the Emperor ; and this all the more as formerly, on the conclusion of the Religious Peace, they had expressly promised not to find fault with him, or presume to dictate to him, on this point.¹

To this imperial statement the petitioners sent an answer, which called forth the strongest animadversion from the town delegates. Their first objection, they said, was that ‘in religious transactions the higher Estates took upon themselves to forestall the towns,’ as though the latter were bound to accept without a protest whatever they decided. A further objection was ‘the acerbity of the language, for which their chiefs would not be in any way held responsible.’ If the Elector’s councillors proceeded any further in their

¹ Erstenberger, pp. 37^b-39.

religious transactions and passed any more resolutions without consulting the towns, ‘the towns would not give their assent.’ They insisted that the wording of the reply must be softened down. ‘But we could do nothing with them,’ the Frankfort delegate complained; ‘on the contrary, they declared that if the Elector of Saxony’s councillors had received their prince’s orders sooner, they would have made their answer even sharper and more pointed. They indulged in a vast amount of unnecessary talk against the towns, and said that if the delegates were already so fearful of provoking the anger of the Emperor, what would they do when it came to the Recess (document summing up the resolutions of the Diet)? For then indeed there would be hard nuts to crack.’ ‘Moreover, they hurried us on so much that we had not time for the necessary discussion among ourselves.’¹

As the towns that professed the Augsburg creed were, with few exceptions, not minded to gratify the princes and lords by voting for the removal of the Reservation, so these same princes and lords showed, for the present, no inclination to ask the Emperor for an ‘explanation’ of the terms of the Religious Peace in favour of the towns of mixed creeds, in which towns, according to the treaty, ‘both religions were to be tolerated.’ The Protestant municipal authorities of such towns regarded it as ‘tyranny over their consciences’ that they should be bound to allow the practice of the Catholic religion within their city walls. The town council of Frankfort, in their instructions to their delegates to the Ratisbon Diet in 1556, had said

¹ Report of Daniel zum Jungen, dated Jan. 15, 1559, in the *Reichstagsacten*, 67, fol. 52.

that, whereas all the other secular Estates had had liberty given them by the Religious Peace to deal with religion in their own jurisdictions as they pleased, it was an obvious injustice that the towns should be forced to tolerate popish abuses within their walls. This, they said, was a very serious grievance, ‘not only on account of the scandalous and unchristian abominations’ which the towns were obliged to look on at, but also because of the offensive and schismatic teaching and the dangerous disturbances of all sorts which were likely to result from such policy. Their delegate was enjoined to use all his endeavours with the other town delegates, and with the electors and princes, for the removal of this restriction of the religious liberty of the towns.¹ On May 11, 1559, the council of Frankfort renewed their injunction with all the more hope of a good result, ‘because,’ they wrote, ‘three lay electors belong now to our religion, and are therefore likely to be in favour of this measure.’² The town delegates brought their grievance before the Estates of the Augsburg Confession, but the Elector Palatine Frederic was the only one among them who was ready to take any active steps to insure that for the future the towns should not be obliged to exercise tolerance towards their Catholic inhabitants. It was a matter of duty with him, he said, to work for the removal of this municipal grievance. He assured the delegates that he was no less anxious to protect their consciences in this respect, and to do all in his power to get popery cleared out of the towns, than was his predecessor, Otto Henry, who had himself been anxious to give his services towards freeing the towns from the necessity of tolerating Catholicism. An

¹ *Reichstagsacten*, 66^b, fol. 14-21.

² *Ibid.* 67, fol. 27^b.

appeal to this effect should, he said, be addressed to the Emperor. ‘But on making inquiries,’ writes the Frankfort delegate on July 8, ‘I did not find that any one was ready to co-operate with his electoral grace.’¹

The Treaty of Religious Peace was confirmed and ratified, without amendments, in the Recess of the Diet of Augsburg, but the essential stipulations in it remained ‘now as then, mere words on paper.’ The Ecclesiastical Reservation was not cancelled; but this, as the Catholic Estates complained, did not prevent the Protestant princes from ‘drawing one bishopric after another into their religion and into their families, and, either by means of venal, pliable instruments, or else by force, from placing themselves in possession of these ecclesiastical territories.’² For instance, the Elector Augustus of Saxony, who ‘at Diets was always anxious that the question of the Reservation should be dealt with in a discreet and Christian manner,’ ‘because it was more likely that they would attain their object in such a manner,’ now by these same ‘Christian means and measures’ as good as incorporated the bishopric of Meissen in his own territory. The Meissen canon, John von Haugwitz, before his elevation to the episcopal see, had been employed as ‘a pliable instrument’ in a secret treaty with the Elector, had renounced his bishopric’s direct allegiance to the Emperor, and had sworn, ‘in the fulfilment of his official duties,’ ‘to plant, establish, and maintain

¹ *Reichstagsacten*, 67, fol. 63. Concerning the Augsburg Diet of 1559, see the detailed account by Wolf, *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Protestanten*, pp. 162–214.

² Record in the *Reichshandlungen* of 1556, fol. 21, quoted at p. 123, note 3, of this volume.

by his own personal efforts, and as far as in him lay, the true Christian religion in all the districts of the bishopric of Meissen where it was not yet adopted.' And at the same time, to secure his appointment, this same Christian canon took a solemn oath, in accordance with rules of the bishopric, 'that he would feed and maintain the flock entrusted to him in the Catholic religion, that he would not suffer any possession or privilege of the bishopric to be tampered with or lost, and that he would render loyal and respectful obedience to his superiors, above all to the Pope.' He invested a delegate with plenary power to take an oath of fidelity to the Pope in his name, and to solicit papal confirmation of his election.¹ He obtained this confirmation, but resigned later on in favour of the Elector Augustus, and boasted mockingly that he had committed three deadly sins which the Pope would nevermore forgive him: namely, he had become a Protestant; he had married; and, contrary to all the marriage laws of the Roman Church, he had espoused a near blood-relation.²

And thus, in spite of the Religious Peace, the bishopric of Meissen was lost to the Catholic Church and to the Empire, and went to the Elector.

The Elector also found means of appropriating the bishoprics of Merseburg and Naumburg.³ The Protestant Estates themselves once alluded to the fact that Saxony had taken possession of the bishopric of Naumburg in violation of the express terms of the

¹ Richter, *Verdienste*, pp. 54-60. Ritter, i. 192.

² Richter, *Verdienste*, p. 63.

³ See Ritter, i. 193 f. The last Catholic bishop of Merseburg was not named Helling, as Ritter has it, but Helding.

Religious Peace.¹ Besides the bishoprics of Meissen, Naumburg, and Merseburg, the archbishoprics of Magdeburg and Bremen, and the bishoprics of Havelberg, Brandenburg, Lebus, Cammin, Schwerin, Verden, Lübeck, Osnabrück, Ratzeburg, Halberstadt, and Minden were also gradually withdrawn from the Church,² and everything Catholic or, to use the ordinary phraseology, all ‘popish, idolatrous abominations were everywhere swept away by Divine command.’ The Catholic Estates were obliged to content themselves with vain protests. Neither they nor the Emperor had the power to oppose any serious resistance to the advancing tide of Protestantism. Nevertheless, they were constantly accused by the Protestant party of breaking the Treaty of Religious Peace to which they were bound by holy oaths,’ and declared guilty of ‘most criminal assaults and intrigues against the Augsburg Confessionists.’

In a petition of grievances drawn up by the Catholics at the Augsburg Diet in 1559, it was said : ‘If means are not found to stop the persistent attacks made by the Protestant Estates, in direct violation of the terms of the Religious Peace, this treaty will serve no other purpose than the complete extinction of the Catholic religion.’ This, however, was precisely the object aimed at by the Augsburg Confessionists, ‘as may be learnt partly from the Recesses of some of the Diets and partly from the express statements of the Protestant delegates at the late conference at Worms.’³

Among the Protestants there were not wanting some

¹ We shall refer again to this later on.

² Ritter, i. 194 f., 197 f.

³ (‘Gravamina Catholicorum’ of July 10, 1559, a copy of which is in the Frankfort *Reichstagsacten*, 68, fol. 92–106.) Lehmann, p. 89.

who were ready to break out in open war against the Catholic Estates, and who for this purpose were organising a general political alliance of the Protestant Estates. The Landgrave Philip of Hesse was indefatigably active in this direction.¹ Melanchthon, on being asked for advice, spoke decisively against the contemplated league, adding, however, that he did not think such a league would be possible. To begin a war in violation of the Religious Peace which had been agreed to, and which the Emperor had pledged himself to respect, would be a flagrant outrage of justice, he said in a memorandum of December 18, 1559. ‘And,’ he added, ‘if it should be retorted that “the persecutors of our Church will not abstain from fighting, therefore we must forestall them: it would never do to sit down quietly and wait for the first blow,” or other desperate seditious arguments of the sort be used, I reply that necessary defence against unjust aggression is certainly legitimate; but the houses of Saxony, Brandenburg, and Hesse, already bound together by inherited alliance, do not need fresh leagues of defence. I do not understand why they want to form new confederacies. For I opine that the towns of Saxony, Suabia, and the Rhineland have learnt enough by the Smalcaldian war to prevent them wishing for fresh leagues on account of religion; I opine also that Pomerania, the Duke of Luneburg, the Princes of Anhalt will not let themselves be drawn into any confederacy. There was also,’ he said, ‘the danger that if a strong league were formed, one or two members might embark on an unnecessary war, in which the others would be compelled to join, even

¹ Fuller details in Heidenhain, *Unionspolitik Philipp's von Hessen*, p. 46 f.

though they should wish to remain inactive. Now there are some people who do not stop to consider what may be the results of a small beginning ; but it is to be feared that if there should be a war, the whole of the German Empire would be upset and changed ; electors and princes would afterwards fight against each other and attach themselves to foreign rulers—some to France, some to Burgundy, some to Turkey. In short, it is difficult to foresee where the matter would end. Only think of the war in 1547 ; if God in His mercy had not brought it to a conclusion, who knows what would have been the consequence ? For if these Lords of Saxony, Würtemberg, and Hesse had gained the victory, they would most certainly have fallen upon each other afterwards, and a terrible overthrow and change, which God mercifully spared us at that juncture, would have taken place. Besides all this, the electors, princes, and towns are so disunited in many ways that I cannot believe they will form alliances among each other ; they would never be able to agree as to who should be their leader. Not one of them would wish to strengthen the other ; nor would any of them trust their money to the others ; it would be exactly the same as in the last war, when the princes complained that some got more money and profit than others.¹

The endless political intricacies of the time, the mutual distrust and ill-feeling that existed among the Protestant sects, and above all the yearly increasing bitterness of the contentions between the different sects had crippled the belligerent power of the Protestants, and it was chiefly from these causes that the

¹ *Corp. Reform.* ix. 987-989. Cf. Heidenhain, pp. 122 ff.

war which many people had been expecting to break out under the pretext of religion was pushed back to a more distant period.

But now as before it was asked by many of the Protestant princes whether the dissensions among the confessors of the true and pure Gospel could not be settled by pacific means, and all the evangelicals be united in one body against the antichristian, idòlatrous Papacy ? Philip of Hesse's advice, given during the Diet at Augsburg, was that a general synod should be convened of all the evangelical Christians, including the Zwinglians in Switzerland, who were also to be summoned to the assembly.¹ Duke Christopher of Würtemberg also again advocated the summoning of a 'general evangelical synod,' advising, however, that it should be confined to the Estates who had subscribed to the Confession of Augsburg. But Christopher's chief theologian, John Brenz, who strongly opposed the idea of a synod, said that these Estates would never come to an agreement as to who was to be the arbiter in the disputed points ; each one, he said, would wish to be the judge ; none would submit to the decisions of others ; 'a set of disputatious, quarrelsome, excitable young theologians would only increase the controversies.'²

Melanchthon also was as decided as he had been before in his warnings against a synod from which, he said, only worse schism could result. On the same

¹ Neudecker, *Neue Beiträge*, i. 193, and Heidenhain, *Unionspolitik Philipp's von Hessen*, pp. 58 ff., 86 ff.

² Brenzen's *Beidenken* of May 18, 1559, in Sattler iv., Beil. No. 54. It ends with the distich :

'Curando quædam fieri pejora videmus
Vulnera, quæ melius non tetigisse juvat

day on which he sent in his memorandum against a political league of the Protestant Estates, December 18, 1559, he wrote as follows concerning the proposed evangelical synod: ‘Many of the Estates, notably the Elector of Brandenburg, the Dukes of Lüneburg, Pomerania, and Prussia, the Princes of Anhalt, the towns of Nuremberg, Breslau, Lübeck, Lüneburg, and others would not send delegates to a synod. And who, may I ask, is to convoke it? Who is to preside over it? What is the order of procedure to be? What articles are to be discussed? Moreover, it is to be feared that an opposition synod may be held. If anybody imagines that one fixed formulary of doctrine can be drawn up, which all sects shall subscribe to and all potentates respect and defend, I for my part declare this to be entirely “a platonic idea.” For the potentates themselves are wavering and changeable, and nothing can be so precisely settled but that angry sophists can pick holes somewhere and find something to cavil at. Therefore the electors and princes will not be in a hurry to agree to a proposal of this sort.’¹

¹ *Corp. Reform.* ix. 989-993.

CHAPTER VII

MELANCHTHON ON THE RELIGIOUS DISSENSIONS AMONG THE PROTESTANTS — HIS DEATH, IN 1560 — THE FLACIANS IN THE DUCHY OF SAXONY

NONE could know better than Melanchthon, and none had more reason than he to grieve deeply over, the innumerable divisions and controversies among theologians, and the mutual embitterment of hearts within the pale of the new Church. For years he had been revered, next to Luther, as the highest evangelical light, and now, in the last years of his life, he was denounced by many of his earlier friends and followers who called themselves Luther's special disciples, as an apostate Mameluke, a servant of Satan, a veritable scourge of the Church.¹ Flacius Illyricus and his associates even went so far as to demand a public condemnation of Melanchthon on the charge of heresy and of falsifying the Confession of Augsburg. The orthodoxy of the Wittenbergers, said Flacius, lives with Tannhäuser in the Venusberg.² The attacks on him were so frequent and ferocious that Melanchthon, in writing to the Landgrave Philip of Hesse in 1558, had no scruples in describing his Lutheran enemies as idolatrous, sophistical blood-hounds. His laments were unceasing of the general distracted state of affairs,

¹ Letter from Wittenberg, dated Aug. 23, 1559, in the *Erinnerungsblatt an Melanchthon* (1760), p. 5.

² Wilkens, p. 32.

‘the frenzy of men’s minds,’ ‘the Cainite bitterness of their hatred.’ Several times in his letters he says that even could he shed as many tears as the waters of the swollen Elbe, he should still not have wept out the sorrow of his heart.¹ The condition of the new Church appeared to him hopeless. ‘Of what use is it to write,’ he laments to his friend Hardenberg, ‘since I am unable to suggest anything that could heal this anarchy?’²

Seeing that in the course of years Melanchthon himself had materially altered his opinions on many points of dogma, especially on the question of free-will and the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament, it might have been expected that he would have shown greater consideration towards the opinions of others. But with increasing age he became, as his opponents with good reason reproached him, more and more bitter and intolerant in controversy. When the rulers and magistrates did not inflict the severest penalties on the authors of impious doctrines, he threatened them with Divine retribution ; he was for ever clamouring for the extermination of the Anabaptists ; he commended the burning of Servet ; he justified the execution of an Osianderite who had asserted that the blood

¹ See this and many similar utterances in Döllinger, i. 394 ff.

² *Corp. Reform.* viii. 504. ‘Melanchthon,’ says Gillet, i. 33, ‘was too near the courts, especially the court of the Saxon Elector, not to be aware of the sordid and interested motives which make use of these religious dissensions for their own ends. He saw that personal and party hatred had fully as much to do with them as zeal for the pure doctrine. Above all must he have been alarmed at the demoralising influence which these dissensions exercised on the Church ; he must have watched with dismay the gradual advance of corruption and impurity into the very heart of the body ecclesiastical, to whom at last any and every means seemed legitimate, if only it afforded weapons for the ruin of the adversary. Could any age have been more fruitful in scandalous

of Christ cannot be our righteousness ; he made it out to be a matter of duty that Theobald Thammer should be put to death publicly because he had expressed his opinion that even the heathens might be saved. He wanted to see the whole sect of Schwenckfeldianders put to the rout by the might of the princes ; and even those among the Augsburg Confessionists who thought faith alone sufficient for salvation, and who set no store by ‘the obedience of the regenerate,’ deserved, in his opinion, to incur the full rigour of the civil tribunal.¹

‘Anger, grief, and excessive work,’ he said, ‘are eating out my life.’² ‘The moral corruption which, in the train of religious anarchy, was penetrating ever deeper and deeper, filled his soul with deeper and deeper distress.’ ‘Among the bulk of the people,’ he wrote in 1558, ‘insubordination has reached such a pitch that they will tolerate no restraint whatever.

abuse of confidence, in malignant watching for unguarded words, in brutal sin against justice and morality, than these years of fighting for a pure and unadulterated faith ? Interception of letters, treacherous information against unsuspecting hosts, literary robbery—all these were weapons despised by few.’

¹ *Corp. Reform.* vii. 523 and ix. 125, 133, 579, 798. In an article entitled ‘Melanchthon as Jurist’ A. Haenel says: ‘Melanchthon insisted that the civil authorities ought first and foremost to run the gauntlet against every form of erroneous belief, and to suppress and punish everything, either in the shape of words or of actions, which involved recognition of such false doctrine, and that they ought to force on the people the adoption and practice of the true faith.’ ‘Freedom of religion was denied at every turn by dogmatic preaching of intolerance.’ ‘When Melanchthon wrote to Calvin concerning the execution of Servet: “Your officials acted rightly when they put that blasphemous man to death according to law and judgment” (*Corp. Reform.* viii. 362), these words are not, as has been maintained, the passionate outburst of the moment, but the hard outcome of a hard and fast doctrine’ (*Zeitschr. für Rechtsgesch.* viii. 262, 264).

² ‘Short Account by the Wittenberg Professors,’ p. 22 ; Döllinger, i. 494.

While flattering themselves that they hold the true faith and are living members of the Church, they go on in foolhardy security and cyclopean wantonness, and fall a daily prey to the devil, who incites them to adultery, murder, and other execrable crimes. This terrible wickedness and immorality, if not checked by stern measures of reform, will be followed by fearful chastisement. Are we not already being visited by one calamity after another? Civil war, social anarchy, and evils innumerable are overtaking us.' He feared that God would send 'even much greater punishments still on the nation because of the unbounded licence, insubordination, and wickedness of the young.'¹

'In the midst of this dismal anarchy and confusion in the Church,' he had for many years longed to leave the world.² When he fell ill in 1560 he had no desire to recover. A solar eclipse and the conjunction of Saturn and Mars were interpreted by him as signs of his speedy departure.³ Rejoicing in his 'release from this sophistical age,' he died at Wittenberg on April 19, 1560. A notice posted up by the vice-rector of the university told of the cruel anguish of all sorts in which he had ended his days.⁴

It was not without reason that Melanchthon had complained of the insubordination of the rising generation. A few months after his death the university was called upon to pass censure on the atrocious behaviour of a band of rowdy students who in the

¹ Döllinger, i. 403.

² *Corp. Reform.* viii. 674, 832.

³ Schmidt, *Melancthon*, p. 662.

⁴ 'Ærumnosam vitam egit in perpetuis laboribus, fatigationibus, afflictionibus, exagitationibus, criminationibus, insidiis et morsibus, quibus a summis, infimis, exteris, indigatis, hostibus et discipulis sine fine et modo impetus et laceratus est' (Strobel, *Neue Beiträge*, 1^b, 103).

middle of the night attacked the house of ‘the most beloved teacher,’ then inhabited by Melanchthon’s son-in-law, Caspar Peucer, Rector of the University, smashed all the windows, and broke in the walls.¹

The fury of Melanchthon’s theological opponents became altogether boundless. ‘More pamphlets against Melanchthon have already appeared,’ wrote Camerarius to Duke Albert of Prussia in January 1561, ‘and I am much troubled in mind as to what we may be led into by all this unbridled insolence, and as to what will be the end of all this strife and quarrelling, by which already all that peace which the Son of God conferred upon us has been scared away.’²

The Flacians stood out at the University of Jena as ‘the foremost theological champions of the wrath of God,’ and as such made it their business ‘to maintain Luther’s doctrine, the one pure unadulterated Gospel, with thunder and lightning,’ and to rout out ‘the satanic weeds’ of Melanchthonism. The venom of

¹ ‘. . . facinus perpetratum cum contumelia scelerate adversus piæ sanctæque memoriæ carissimum præceptorem nostrum et ejus honestissimam familiam’ (Strobel, *ibid.* 1^b, 106–108). For the length to which the fury of Melanchthon’s enemies went, see Strobel, 1^a, 174–176. The Wittenberg professor, Paul Eber, says in the preface to Melanchthon’s *Comment. Ep. ad Corinth.*: ‘Qui quasi parum a suis alumnis et discipulis esset flagellatus dum viveret, etiam mortuus conquiescere non potest, quin ex iis, quibuscum non modo publice doctrinam, sed privatim etiam quæ habuit et potuit consilia et secreta sua communicavit, quibus etiam cor suum, si licuisset, ex pectore exemptum impertivisset, aliqui in exsangue corpus sepulti sœviant, vindictæ studio tanto et acerbitate tanta, ut credam, si coram ipsis miserum et jam putrescens cadaver Philippi expositum sit, eos dentibus more canum irruituros, et frustulatim carnem ejus laceraturos esse.’ Camerarius concludes his biography of Melanchthon with the words: ‘Tota farrago hujus libri, quid aliud complectitur quam curas, labores, sollicitudines, dolores, denique miserias Ph. Melanchthonis?’

² Voigt, *Briefwechsel*, p. 132.

sacramentarism, they said, was penetrating further and further into the Palatinate, into Hesse, Würtemberg, and elsewhere ; Adiaphorism was the origin of all the corruption of the day ; it was the Beast of the Apocalypse, the hyena which would finally bring all Germany back again under the dominion of the Antichrist. It was the duty of the rulers and magistrates, and of the whole nation to extirpate this heresy, and to load all the impenitent with anathemas, even were they the chiefest apostles or even angels. It was only, they said, because the ruling authorities had not pronounced the ban on these heretics, that so many false sects and corrupters of the truth had crept in. A synod must be held at which the teachers of the Church should pronounce decision on all the disputed points, after which the princes must clear away all satanic leaven.¹ The Flacians, be it said, wished to be considered the sole ‘teachers of the Church.’

They were still high in the favour of Duke John Frederic of Saxony. Flacius was flattered and cajoled at the ducal court, and by command of the Duke was appointed chief superintendent of all the other superintendents, in which capacity he was to prevent all innovations by pastors or other clergymen.² The Frankfort Recess, condemned by the Flacians as a work of the devil, was of course also regarded with extreme loathing by the Duke ; he could not alter his opinion of it, John Frederic wrote to Philip of Hesse in 1559, for he could not approve of honour being withdrawn from God Almighty, and given to the devil.³

Meanwhile, ‘to the great scandal of the people,’

¹ Heppe, *Gesch. des Protestantismus*, 1 ; Beil. 34, pp. 114–126.

² Wilkens, p. 107.

³ Neudecker, *Beiträge*, i. 199.

odious religious dissensions had broken out in Jena itself and through the whole duchy. The Jena theologian, Victorin Strigel, at strife with Flacius, had sent in to the Duke a remonstrance against the ‘Book of Confutation,’ which he accused of containing false assertions. For instance, it pronounced an unjust condemnation of the proposition that the ‘Gospel is the preaching of repentance and forgiveness of sins,’ and it declared repentance and acknowledgment of sins to be dead works of the law. If Flacius, so Strigel maintained, ‘rejected all co-operation of the human will in the process of conversion, and affirmed that the power of the Holy Spirit overcame even the impenitent who opposed him with obstinate resistance, such an assertion contradicted the 18th article of the Confession of Augsburg, which taught that our justification is wrought when we assent to the Divine Word.’ Strigel begged the Duke not to insist that his conscience must be bound down by this book, but to allow him to remain faithful to the simple Catechism.¹ The Duke treated this remonstrance as heresy and rebellion. On March 24, 1559, he issued a warrant against Strigel and his friend Hugel, superintendent at Jena. ‘On holy Easter day,’ writes Justus Jonas the younger to Duke Albert of Prussia, ‘one hundred arquebusiers and from fifty to sixty mounted soldiers were mustered, and between two and three o’clock at night they were let in to Jena. They went straight to Victorin’s house, and with great violence and uproar they broke in the doors with hatchets; whereupon Victorin and his wife hurried down in their nightclothes. The soldiers then said, “We’ve come to fetch you, you villain, and to

¹ Salig, iii. 480.

take you to the only place fit for you.” The poor frightened wife began to scream “Murder! murder!” whereupon one of the Judas band pointed a musket at her and said: “Hold your tongue, you parson’s whore, or I’ll shoot a bullet through you!”¹ Strigel and Hugel were then led away like malefactors, placed half naked in a cart, and taken first to the Leuchtenberg, and then to the Grimmenstein. All the way along they were subjected to maltreatment. A respectable Weimar burgher, who was said to have spoken against the Book of Confutation, was also put in chains. At the intercession of several Protestant princes, Strigel and Hugel were liberated in September, after having first promised not to oppose the Book of Confutation, and not to leave Jena until the case against them had been tried and settled.²

The deacon Winter was appointed superintendent in place of Hugel, and this man, with the connivance of the theological professors, Simon Musäus and John Wigand, excommunicated the lay professors, Wesenbeck and Dürfield, because they were suspected of false doctrine and were friends of Strigel. Other members of the university also, besides town councillors, burghers, and burgesses, were excommunicated for the crime of being friends of Strigel.³ In Luther’s days, Wesenbeck wrote to the Duke, even flayers and Papists were allowed to stand as sponsors, ‘and now they reject me, although I am a subscriber to the Augsburg Confession.’³

Bitter party divisions now took place among the students and the burghers of Jena. Wesenbeck was

¹ A contribution from Voigt, in Raumer’s *Histor. Taschenbuch*, 1831, pp. 289–290.

² Müller, *Staatscabinet*, i. 134.

³ Salig, iii. 586.

openly insulted by the students, and he complained that as an outlaw his life was not safe.¹ Winter and his deacons, on the other hand, complained to the Duke, whom they called ‘the vicegerent of God,’ that on account of their attachment to the true doctrine their ‘lives and possessions were at the mercy of their bloodthirsty and Cainite adversaries,’ who called the Duke’s Book of Confutation a ‘book of lies.’²

With a view to the settlement of these quarrels the Duke, in August 1560, caused a disputation to be held between Flacius and Strigel at Weimar. Half Jena came to listen. During thirteen sessions the disputants, in the presence of John Frederic, went on incensing and exasperating each other on the subjects of original sin and free-will. Flacius denied free-will altogether, and put forward the proposition that original sin was not only a quality but the substance or essence of human nature. ‘Man,’ he said, ‘with regard to spiritual things, was not merely like unto a block of wood or a statue ; he was even lower in the scale than these, for a block or a statue did not hate and offend God. He was lower than the moon ; for this orb reflected the light of the sun, whereas man was wholly dead to all good ; through original sin the image of God in him had been changed into the image of the devil.’ All psychological and anthropological arguments brought forward by Strigel were repulsed by Flacius on the ground that they proceeded from philosophy and from reason, which was utterly blind as far as the things of God were concerned ; that execrable beast, Reason, as Luther had so truly said, must be altogether annihilated. When Strigel asserted that the Holy Ghost did not

¹ Müller, *Staatscabinet*, i. 51.

² *Ibid.* i. 135-140.

operate in men as though they were lifeless blocks and stones; that a certain synergy (co-operation) must be attributed to the human will, for that in many passages of the Bible demands and exhortations were addressed to this activity of the will, Flacius met his antagonist with the words of Luther that from Bible commands or exhortations the power of complying with them could not be inferred. After the thirteenth sitting the Duke gave orders that, for many different reasons, the disputation must now be closed, but that it should be resumed a little later on and continued to the end. Strigel declared that he should not be moved from his opinion, ‘even though the hangman were at his throat,’ and Flacius adhered firmly to his assertion that ‘original sin is the *substance* of fallen man.’ For if it were not the substance, then it must be an accident; but no substance is corrupted by an accident, and yet all Lutherans agreed that the human substance is no longer uncorrupted. After this the Lutherans were divided into Substantialists and Accidentists, and soon the miners in the Hartz mountains might be heard asking each other: ‘Are you an Occident or a Substanzioner?’ and, according to the answer received, bloody quarrels would often ensue.¹

Since the event of the Weimar disputation, the Flacians had sunk in estimation at the ducal court. Schröter, John Frederic’s influential physician, called Flacius ‘a rogue and a villain, whose writings were full of lies and calumnies.’² The chancellor Brück

¹ Salig, iii. 588-615; Döllinger, iii. 444-449; Möhler, *Neue Untersuchungen*, pp. 45 ff.

² Salig, iii. 629.

also inclined to Strigel's views. Attacks on the Flacians in the shape of apophthegms, comic verses, pasquinades, &c., were affixed to cathedrals, churches, shambles, and house-doors. If these men were all hung together on one rope, said the people, it would be a rare bit of good fortune for the Duke of Saxony.¹ The Flacians, on their part, regarded their opponents as poisonous weeds, and called the chancellor Brück a devil's messenger who used Strigel to cover his own shame.²

At the suggestion of his physician and his chancellor the Duke now resolved to establish a consistory, composed of four spiritual and four temporal members, with himself as president, to carry on the management of all ecclesiastical matters ; in it the power of excommunication was to be exclusively vested, and without its sanction no writings, either of clerics or laymen, were to pass through the press. The Flacians were excluded from sitting in this court, and they accordingly sent an address to the Duke threatening him with the most dreadful punishments for his interference in Church matters. The fate of Saul and Ozias, they said, might overtake him. Portents of all sorts had already been observed ; snakes and vipers crawling up fruit-trees in quantities ; pools of blood in the rampart ditches at Weimar ; storks leaving the town in the direction of the gallows ; bees with Turkish turbans on their heads. All these omens, they said, prognosticated approaching disaster, for the manner in which the Almighty punished mockery and ill-treatment of His faithful servants was exemplified in the stories of the forty children of Bethel

¹ Wilkens, pp. 111-112.

² See the poem by Weller, ii. 38-42.

who were torn to pieces by bears, and by the captains of the bands on whom fire fell from heaven.¹

These ‘clerical attempts at inquisition’ disposed John Frederic to ‘religious reconciliation’ with the other Protestant princes in a future convention of princes.

The Elector Palatine Frederic and Duke Christopher of Würtemberg were now all the more strongly in favour of a closer union among the Augsburg Confessionists, both in religious and political affairs, because, since the accession of Pope Pius IV. in December 1559, friendly relations had existed between the papal and imperial courts, and the Pope was in treaty with the Emperor and the Catholic Estates with regard to summoning a general council.

The negotiations relating to this council give a deep insight into the general politico-religious situation ; but they can only be rightly understood by means of closer acquaintance with the religious and moral conditions in the imperial hereditary lands, and in those districts of the Empire which were still under Catholic dominion.

¹ Salig, iii. 636–639.

CHAPTER VIII

RELIGIOUS AND MORAL ANARCHY IN AUSTRIA

IN the imperial hereditary dominions, as in all other parts of the Empire, the new gospel of justification by faith alone had found a large number of adherents. ‘Evangelical freedom, as the new preachers proclaim it,’ said King Ferdinand once to the Franciscan monk Egenolf, ‘is a soft and pleasant cushion for multitudes of people. Year after year the number of those increases, both among the higher and the lower classes, who find it very delectable to be taught that it is right to appropriate Church and convent property; that Christians are not called upon to bestow endowments, or to give alms, or say prayers, or fast; that the confessional should be fled from as an accursed abomination, and that no performance of good works is necessary to salvation.’¹

From the time when in 1552, with the consent of George Slatkonia, Bishop of Vienna, a feeble, impotent man, the married preacher, Paul Speratus, had inveighed from the pulpit of St. Stephen’s against the celibacy of priests and ‘demoralising’ monastic vows; had exhorted monks to leave their monasteries and to marry, and had proclaimed Luther’s doctrine of justification, apostasy from the old faith had become an

¹ Quoted from the warning *Wider die sectirischen Rumohrmacher*, pp. 3–4.

open practice. ‘All the more so,’ said King Ferdinand, ‘because much of the irregularity, idleness, luxury, and concubinage, which so scandalise the populace, lies at the door of the priests, monks, and nuns. Thus, since the heretical sects and doctrines have taken deeper root, things have grown steadily worse and worse, so that now the really good priests have lost the upper hand; divine worship and the Holy Sacraments are held in contempt; order and discipline are scarcely ever enforced; and the people become from year to year more uncivilised, insubordinate, and bestial.’¹

The writings of Luther and of other religious innovators were zealously reprinted and propagated in Vienna and elsewhere, and libellous pamphlets and caricatures against temporal and spiritual rulers flooded the land. In Austria also, under the cloak of ‘the beloved Gospel and Christian freedom,’ doctrines subversive of all existing order were taught and put in practice. The nature of this teaching and practice may be gathered from a mandate, issued by Ferdinand on August 20, 1527, which decrees that, ‘Whosoever attacks or dishonours with blasphemous talk, preaching or writing, the divinity or the humanity of Christ, His birth, passion, resurrection, and ascension, shall be burnt with fire; whoever impugns, slanders, or casts doubts on the purity of the Virgin Mary, or says or writes that she was not different from other women, and that she committed mortal sin, that person must be punished either in life, body, or goods and chattels; and so also must all who are guilty of destroying a picture of Christ on the Cross, or any images of saints.’

¹ See preceding note.

Polygamy and the teaching of communism and anarchism were subjected to the heaviest penalties.¹

As was to be expected, the turbulence of the times had a disastrous effect on education. We read in a contemporary writer that, ‘The more warlike the times became, the more the invasions of the Turks increased in frequency and in barbarity, the more apostasy from the true religion spread among the clergy and the laity, so much the more did the schools deteriorate and decay. The practice of constantly preaching against the clergy and circulating libellous pamphlets against them brought them gradually into greater and greater discredit, till at last there was everywhere a great scarcity of priests, even in Tyrol, where, before the so-called new Gospel sprang up and filled the world with its noise, the priesthood had been held in high veneration.’² These statements are confirmed from many other contemporary sources. Bishop George von Brixen complained, in the year 1529, that during the last four years not more than two priests had been ordained through the whole diocese, and that if God did not intervene, there would be a great dearth, not only of able, efficient priests, but of priests of any sort.³ Eleven years later his successor, Bishop Christopher, spoke even more strongly: ‘It was a hard matter,’ he said, ‘to carry on divine worship with reverence and propriety, owing to the dearth of priests.’ ‘And those we do manage occasionally to procure are for the most part apostate monks who wander about from place to place, and are here to-day,

¹ Wiedemann, i. 25–47. *Wider die sectirischen Rumohrmacher*, 9–12.

² *Wider die sectirischen Rumohrmacher*, p. 15.

³ Sinnacher, vii. 275–276.

elsewhere to-morrow;'¹ many of the priests 'are infected by the tempting new sectarianism.'² 'Good God,' wrote George Kirchmair in 1538 respecting the priests of the diocese of Brixen, 'the seven deadly sins have become as daily bread to our clergy here!'³ John Faber, a theologian who was appointed Bishop of Vienna in 1533, and was a most zealous shepherd of souls, gives his testimony as follows: 'From want of good priests everything is going to ruin. The parishes, churches, and parsonages are burnt by the Turks, and the pastors are massacred. I am a bishop without any clergy. The superiors of the mendicant orders in Vienna pay no heed to the bishops. The cathedral chapter and the prebendaries ought to be subject to the bishop both in spiritual and temporal matters, but they are determined to be free and independent, and the bishop is to them a nonentity. If I try to be more than a zero, I have either to quarrel and battle with the mendicant monks, the Viennese, the university, and my own cathedral chapter, or else to leave the filth alone. I have no power whatever.'⁴ Faber's successor, Frederic Nausea, complained that the Bishop of Vienna had no authority over the cathedral chapter, which cared very little for the service of God, and whose lay members caused general scandal by their profligate behaviour and their unsuitable mode of dress. He further attested that the bishop had not the slightest influence over the learned institutions of his diocese, nor over the national schools; that the teachers were

¹ Sinnacher, vii. 363-364.

² *Ibid.* vii. 343-344.

³ Kirchmair, p. 497. Hirn's account of the religious condition in the Tyrol is drawn from original documents, and is as exhaustive as can be desired (i. 71-278).

⁴ Wiedemann, ii. 2-3.

left to teach just what they pleased, so long as their instruction was not in the spirit of the Catholic Church. The schools of Vienna rarely produced as many as one or two clergymen, although their scholars and students numbered nearly 600. Hence the dearth of priests.¹ ‘The young men of to-day do not care for Holy Orders,’ wrote the Jesuit Peter Canisius from Vienna in 1554; ‘I am told that in the last twenty years scarcely twenty priests have come out of the university. The livings are either unoccupied, or else in the hands of apostate, licentious men. If God in His providence does not send a large supply of labourers here, the people will not only become heretics, but will sink to the level of unreasoning brutes. It is a wonder to me that the right-minded among them have not died the deaths of martyrs.’² Four years later the same man wrote that Vienna was ‘daily growing more and more like Wittenberg or Geneva. Indeed, all the right-minded inhabitants, above all the staunch Catholics at the court of the Emperor and the Queen, are contemplating flight.’³

The extent to which the religious revolution was responsible for the falling-off of the clergy may be seen by comparison of the reports of the church and convent inspectors in the years 1528, 1544, 1555, and later. At each fresh visitation the increase of disorder and anarchy was shown by an increasing number of flagrant cases. ‘All classes of people have become

¹ Nausea’s *Beschwerdeschrift*, contributed by Sebastian Brunner in the *Studien und Mittheilungen aus dem Benedictiner- und Cistercienser-Orden*, Jahrg. 3; Heft iii. 162–164.

² To Pater John Polanco at Rome, Jan. 5, 1554. Braunsberger, *Epistulae Canisii*, i. 444.

³ To Lainez on Sept. 30, 1558.

so averse to the monastic life and to religion,' the inspectors report, 'that scarcely any one nowadays will go into a cloister. The ordinaries, provincials, vicars, and prelates have all grown so cold and indifferent that they do not trouble themselves about this terrible state of things, do not solicit help or advice, and are not even glad when any interest is taken in monasteries.' The convert Frederic Staphylus said in 1554, in a report to the King, that the secular clergy were utterly perverted ; there were as many sects as there were parishes, and each clergyman altered the doctrines and ceremonies according to his taste ; moreover, among a hundred priests there was scarcely one who had not got one wife at least. In the year 1561 the Emperor Ferdinand wrote as follows concerning the archduchy of Upper and Lower Austria : ' It is with the deepest distress that we have heard that in nearly all the monasteries and convents the venerable Sacrament of the Altar is openly administered to the laity in both kinds. Also that the elements are consecrated without the Mass being said, and are not reserved in the Repository ; that the canon and the collects in Holy Mass are either left out or else altered and perverted in a strange and remarkable manner according to the will of the officiating ministers ; that prayer for the dead is no longer used, and that children are baptised without the ceremonies, with unconsecrated water, and without the chrism. We learn also with inexpressible sorrow that concubinage is gaining ground, not only among the diocesan clergy, but even in the cloisters themselves ; and that many priests and monks shamelessly harbour and maintain their so-called wives, or concubines, inside or outside the monasteries ; whereby

great scandal and offence is given to the laity. In all directions there are numbers of men, either from convents or from foreign parts, who go about preaching seditious, sectarian doctrine, altogether opposed to our true, Christian, Catholic religion, and who lead away from the truth and from the right path, not only the monastic brothers, but also the poor laity. Against such odious crimes as these, serious and stringent measures ought to be instituted.' The number of unworthy prelates and priests was becoming enormous. For instance, the provost of Klosterneuburg was one of these sectarians, and kept a so-called wife either within or without the monastery, and was often in such a state of intoxication that no one in the house was safe in his company. His monks also were addicted to excessive drinking. At Herzogenburg all the conventuals had 'gone over to the sects ;' the provost had a number of wives. The abbot of Molk lived with the wife of a captain, and allowed his monks to go in for 'sectarianism and excessive wine-drinking.' The abbot of Garster and the conventuals at Gleink were all married and lived in drunkenness and gluttony. The conventuals of St. Florian also lived scandalous lives of dancing and banqueting. The abbot of Geras, who lived alone in the monastery with his concubine, had a Lutheran preacher and schoolmaster, allowed the Sacraments to be administered in Lutheran fashion, wore silk apparel, and was a zealous devotee of the bottle.¹

But if the monasteries and convents thus sunk in debauchery and materialism formed by far the

¹ For these and other instances of the degradation of the clergy see the reports in Wiedemann, i. 157 ff.

majority, there were also some wholly different ones, where no scandal existed. The monks of the Franciscan monastery at Egenburg, for instance, were shining examples of virtue. These friars, never more than five in number, held strictly to their rule, endured the scorn, derision, and insults of the sectarians, preached and taught indefatigably. It was owing to their influence that Protestantism, after gaining a wide footing at Egenburg, almost completely disappeared again.¹ The Franciscan province of Austria may be cited in special proof that corruption of morals went hand in hand with religious innovations. Up to the year 1540 an exact register had been kept in the Order of all members who had distinguished themselves, either by services to learning and art, by exemplary fulfilment of official duties, or by a life of holiness. The number of these is not a mean one. But from 1540 onwards, through fully half a century, not one monk is found worthy to be mentioned on this list of distinction ; not even the superiors of the convent of Graz are mentioned. Not till 1585, when a genuine reform of the Order was set on foot, do we note the commencement of a fresh series of names worthy of being handed down to posterity.²

‘The sinful, scandalous lives of the clergy are the chief seed of the sectarian agitation,’ says a ‘poor simple layman’ in 1561, ‘for experience shows that where the poor Christian people have good, pious priests, there they do not fall away from the faith of the Church, or if they chance to be misled they soon come back again. One poor Discalced Carmelite in

¹ Wiedemann, iii. 167.

² Hurter, ii. 56–57. See also Vol. ii. 53 and 63 f.

Upper Austria, in the course of a few years' preaching in different parishes, brought back many hundreds to the true fold ; and wherever this man of apostolic life preaches and administers the Holy Sacrament, the people flock to him. He bears with equanimity hunger, blows, and wounds, as I have myself witnessed, for I was present when a stone struck his head, so that it bled, and yet he went on preaching the duty of love to our neighbours.¹

But a very special share of the blame of 'this constantly increasing demoralisation and anarchy, both in towns and provinces,' must be laid to the door of the worldly-minded and corrupt dignitaries of the Church. Many of the prelates and provosts took advantage of the disturbed state of things 'to appropriate abbey goods ; took to themselves wives, and aspired to temporal authority, revelled away, sectarian-like, the goods of the Church and the poor, and called this serving the cause of the Gospel.' 'Others, in outward appearance, remained true to the old faith,' but 'they troubled themselves very little,' so the Jesuit George Scherer said in later years, 'as to what sort of provision was made in their parochial churches for the service of the pulpit and the altar ; they placed the parishes under the care of the most reprobate and incapable fellows who could neither cackle nor lay eggs, neither preach nor celebrate, nor rightly administer any of the Sacraments, and who lead such unsacerdotal lives that they drive people straight to hell ; for not only do they make no converts, but they strengthen and confirm sinners and sectarians in their iniquitous ways ; not only do they build up nothing,

¹ *Wider die sectirischen Rumohrmacher*, p. 22.

but they break and destroy without limit. Woe unto such prelates who do not provide their sheep with better shepherds ! for they are the authors of eternal perdition and damnation to thousands and thousands of souls. God will avenge on them the ruin of all the lost souls that have perished through their neglect.' 'A good school,' Scherer goes on, 'is undoubtedly a great and precious treasure in a country ; how then can the building and maintenance of schools be otherwise than well-pleasing unto God and incumbent on prelates ? Woe to the prelates who care little or nothing about the schools of the land, who care nothing for the liberal arts, who cannot endure to have learned people around them, and who are the cause that instead of learning and culture there is nothing but barbarism, licence, and gross ignorance all over Germany ! In former times there were no places where study was pursued so diligently as in the cloisters, where the best and most beautiful libraries were always to be found. Now, however, through the fault of some of our prelates, in many localities, study is nowhere so little carried on as in the monasteries, and what few books are left in the libraries fall a prey to mice, beetles, and dust. And all the time the prelates, who not only pay no heed to the rules of the orders, never even read or think about them, still less admonish the members of their communities to observe them, spend their lives in profligacy and frivolity, give themselves up day and night to gluttony and drunkenness, and set most terrible and scandalous examples to all the clergy and laity, to believers and unbelievers, to Catholics and sectarians. They have no fatherly affection for their monks and nuns, they do not even treat them as brethren in

religion, but as bond-servants, as slaves, as menial drudges and stable-boys. They maintain no sort of discipline in the monasteries, they let everything go higgledy-piggledy, do not punish vice, abuse the Church and convent property, incur enormous debts, squander and dissipate the Church revenues in debauchery, and, in short, behave as if it was all their own personal property, and they were as much lords over it as the temporal lords.'¹ 'I must also remark,' says Scherer in his 'Postille,' 'that those bishops and prelates who exercise both spiritual and temporal rule ought to pay more attention to the former than to the latter; for the spiritual order has not been founded and established for the sake of the temporal, but, on the contrary, the temporal for the spiritual. A prelate who takes more delight in fine horses and hounds, in shooting and hunting game, than in praying, preaching, and reading the Mass, or who thinks more about banqueting than pasturing his flock, more about good feeding than the care of souls—such an one is not deserving of praise. Nor are those ecclesiastical rulers to be commended who treat their subjects with greater severity than do the temporal princes. There is a saying which ought always to be made good: 'it is better to be subject to the cope than to the coat of mail'² ('besser zu sitzen unter dem Chorrock als unter dem Panzer'). 'Sitting under the coat of mail,' that is to say, under the dominion of the temporal nobility, had already become odious enough to the people.³

¹ 'Eine Prälaten-Preidigt' in the Munich edition of Scherer's Works, ii. 364 ff.

² Scherer, *Postille (Festtage)*, p. 469. See also his sermon on the Second Sunday after Easter, in the *Postille (Sonntage)*, pp. 596 f.

³ Wiedemann, ii. 646, says not unjustly: 'The Austrian nobles at

The same purpose which, at the beginning of the politico-religious revolution, had animated the imperial knights, and which, under the leadership of Sickingen, they had hoped to realise precipitately by force of arms, now influenced a very large number of the Austrian nobles. The latter, however, forewarned by the disastrous issue of Sickingen's enterprise, did not at once have recourse to armed resistance against the ruling house. As King Ferdinand expressed it, 'they set about to win their way, slowly and step by step, in a covered fight against all supreme government, whether in religious or secular matters, making use of all events and circumstances that could further their end.'

Prominent among circumstances furthering the increase of power and possessions was 'the new Gospel.' Said Herr Adam von Puchheim : 'So we have decided. We are both lords and bishops in our own territory ; we have the right to appoint and depose the clergy ; we are the only sovereign lords whom they are bound to obey ; the revenues of the Church proceed from the endowments of our forefathers, and are therefore ours. Whoever cavils at this decision, or does not submit to it, will be made to feel that there is still a power in the land.'¹ This said, Adam took forcible possession of the parish of Münchenreidt, which was an imperial fief, placed horse and artillery in front of the church,

that time were inexpressibly coarse. The *jus gladii* was then in force in their dominions, and by way of doing honour to this *jus*, they hung, speared, and drowned the people at their pleasure. The *Carolina* was the cloak for these atrocities. The perpetual peasant insurrections are the best commentary on this godless tyranny of the nobles.' When Lisch (*Jahrbücher*, pp. 24, 74) attributes to the Austrian nobility of that period 'high culture, elevation of purpose, power and moderation,' one is forced to ask for instances in point.

¹ Extracts from *Rare Schriften*, p. 71.

and sent word to the parish priest to ‘come and take holy water.’¹

The nobles made free use of their privileges as patrons and lords of the manor to proceed according to this decision. The introduction of the new Gospel was initiated everywhere by the confiscation of Church property, the plunder of parishes, of benevolent Church institutions, and of monasteries.² Preachers flocked in crowds to the support of these nobles, especially from North Germany: ‘followers of every imaginable sect, at war and enmity with each other,’ they were all one in their hatred of all things Catholic. From their suzerain lords the nobles they ‘received a mere pittance for salary,’ and frequently, so they complained, they were treated like bond-servants, for ‘the lords are everywhere tyrannical.’ They boasted of being ‘good evangelicals,’ and ‘while they themselves ate and drank, and squandered their own and the Church’s goods, they thought fit that the clergy should exercise themselves in apostolic poverty, and they left the pastors with their wives and children to suffer want, hunger, and misery.’ The saying of Melanchthon held good for Austria as well as for other places: ‘Those who call themselves evangelicals take to themselves the goods which were bestowed on parishes, pulpits, schools, and churches; and if we are deprived of all these institutions we shall end by becoming heathens.’³ ‘I believe it to be the destiny to which I was born,’ wrote the preacher Nicholas Prætorius (1595) respecting Salomon Pfefferkorn of Ottobach, who suppressed the

¹ Hammer-Purgstall, i.; *Beilagen*, p. 199, No. 94.

² Wiedemann’s work affords solid proofs of this plundering.

³ *Ibid.* i. 75 f.

Catholic worship in Gobelsburg, ‘to be compelled always to live under godless, unjust, sacrilegious, church-plundering masters. My overlord behaves like nearly all the other evangelical rulers in Austria ; he spends the wealthy Church revenues on himself and gives the pastor only a small fixed stipend. He has long been accustomed to ill-use his pastors and to turn them off without any reason ; he pays them very irregularly, moreover, and often the parish has been left more than half a year without any incumbent.’¹ In a great number of parishes the parsonages remained unoccupied for five, ten, fifteen years ; no divine service was held ; ‘the people knew nothing whatever of Christian teaching.’ This is the testimony of many different inspectorial reports. For instance : ‘At Schrattenberg, for the last four years, there has been no pastor ; the glebe lands lie fallow ; the parsonage house is deserted ; Steinabrunn has been left for eleven years without a pastor. Herr von Fünfkirchen² draws the income himself. At Stützenhofen, Herr von Fünfkirchen has appropriated the parish. At Drösing there has been no pastor for eight years, and the people of the place lead profligate, unchristian lives. At Geresdorf, no pastor for fifteen years, the parsonage in ruins, the church in bad repair. Hans Peltram appropriated the glebe, sold the parsonage to a miner, took possession of the church ornaments, and used the chasubles to make frocks for his children.’³ While the nobles were them-

¹ ‘... nobilis, uti fere omnis Evangelicus Magistratus Austriacus solet, bonis ecclesiasticis utitur,’ and so forth, in Raupach, *Presbyt. Austr.* p. 143, note 3.

² ‘Mylord of Five Churches.’

³ Wiedemann, iii. 99, 171, 241–242, 265, 338, 403 (note 2), 424, and many other instances of parishes despoiled.

selves chiefly to blame for the orphaned condition of their parishes, in 1542 they actually had the face to complain, in the name of the ‘new Gospel which ought to be preached in a right Christian sense,’ about ‘the parishes destitute of pastors.’ ‘Many parishes,’ they said, ‘are without pastors, and the common people have, in consequence, become so godless and depraved that it is almost impossible to tame them, and they die like brute beasts without Christian instruction, and without the Sacraments.’¹ The millers by the river Kamp, at Mödring and on the Falkenthal, complained in 1536 that under the influence of the new doctrines ‘all sense of honour, discipline, and conscientiousness among workers were disappearing, and the worship of God decaying.’²

In the year 1556 a committee of the provincial diet of the nether-Austrian Estates petitioned the King ‘to grant protection to the preaching of the pure Word of God’ and to turn his attention ‘to the abolition of the odious superstitions which had crept into the old religion.’ They prayed the King graciously to allow them to adhere to the recognised truth, and to decree that henceforth no attacks should be made on the evangelical preachers and schoolmasters. The pure Word of God, they urged, had at the present day been declared with greater clearness and truth than ever before, and they could not submit to the old religion, which was ‘contrary to the Word of God.’ Ferdinand answered that, as a Catholic King, he did not consider himself justified in overthrowing and setting at nought the salutary statutes and ordinances

¹ Raupach, *Evangel. Oesterreich*, ii. 75-82, Beilagen. See Wiedemann, i. 85-86.

² Wiedemann, iii. 133.

of the Church on his own judgment and responsibility. It had never been his wish to coerce anybody into denial of recognised truth, and he should certainly never be guilty of such an attempt. It was also his desire that the Word of God ‘should be preached freely and openly in churches according to its true Christian meaning; albeit, in the way in which the apostles and martyrs, and the teachers and fathers approved by the Church had taught it. If the Gospel were taught according to the opinions and ideas of each individual, the result would be that in a short time the lands of Lower Austria also would be submerged by heresy and sectarianism. Each separate preacher would claim to be the sole interpreter of the pure Word, and would exalt his own judgment and conscience, declaring that these were not subject to any human creature, but to God only. Experience showed plainly enough what sort of unity was accomplished in belief and in religion when each individual interpreted the Word of God according to his own fancy.¹

Experience of this sort had indeed been in process of acquirement for decades past in Austria. In the year 1560 a fresh edict was issued by the King against the religious schismatics, namely, ‘the Anabaptist, Zwinglian, and Schwenckfeldian sects, which swarmed everywhere.’² Besides the above sects there were the strict Lutherans, the Melanchthonians, the Majorites, the Osianderites, and the Stankarians, who denied the divinity of Christ in the work of redemption. But the sect which gradually gained the largest following

¹ Stüzl, ‘Ausschusstag von 1556,’ in the *Archiv für Kunde österreichischer Geschichtsquellen*, viii. 160–167; Wiedemann, i. 140–148.

² Wiedemann, i. 149–150.

of all was that of the Flacians, who were again subdivided into several other sects. From their founder's doctrine that original sin formed the substance of man, some of the disciples had deduced the conclusion that fallen, unregenerate man was a creature of the devil, and that women in a state of pregnancy were bearing Satan about, and were bound to confess the fact openly before all the world.¹

In view of this general state of religious and moral anarchy Ferdinand was of opinion that, besides the imperative necessity for reform of the secular and monastic clergy, it was also most desirable to conciliate the new religionists 'by reasonable concessions, and so gradually bring them back into the bosom of the Church. ' Among conciliatory measures he included especially the concession of the lay chalice, marriage of the clergy, and the abolition of the law of fasting.' He entered into negotiations on this subject with the Pope in 1560, at the time when the reopening of the Trent Council was under discussion; and he was zealously supported in 'his earnest appeal and claims' by his son-in-law, Duke Albert V. of Bavaria.

¹ We shall have more to say concerning these sects later on.

CHAPTER IX

RELIGIOUS AND MORAL ANARCHY IN BAVARIA AND IN
ECCLESIASTICAL TERRITORIES

IN Bavaria also the new doctrines had become disseminated at an early date. In a leaflet of the year 1524 we read that: 'A certain number of the clergy and the laity, and also some artisans and apprentices, are going about preaching the gospel of the utter corruption of all existing Church organisation, and proclaiming the divine revelation that priests and laymen are all equal, that there must be no more spiritual government, no more confession and fasting, and that good works are not necessary for salvation.' 'In many parts of Bavaria there are a number of these people who are preaching lustily in the highways and byways, in market-places and in taverns, that all temporal rule is unlawful, that it behoves men to have pity on the poor and needy, and that for the glory of God we should rob the wealthy of their splendour and superfluity: for this is the teaching of the holy Gospel and the Word of God, so long hidden in darkness, but in these beatific times at last brought to light again.'¹

In the spring of 1522 the Dukes William IV. and Louis had already issued a stern mandate forbidding all religious innovations, under pain of death, because

¹ *New Weis das heilig Evangelium zu predigen und zu lehren* (1524), Flugblatt, p. 4.

‘ nothing was more certain to result from them than the overthrow of all laws human and divine, of all order and government: they would create grievous and irreparable misunderstanding in the Christian religion, and it would come to pass that everybody would presume to explain the holy Scriptures according to individual understanding and judgment, and the unity of the Christian Church would thereby be destroyed.’¹ Many of these men had to expiate their novel preaching with their lives; the Anabaptists were put to death in great numbers.

Church discipline went altogether to pieces. The higher ecclesiastical offices had long been reserved for the nobility, and it was therefore ‘a very hard task’ for the bishops, as many of themselves complained, to remove unworthy prelates from their posts. ‘How greatly our hands are tied!’ said Bishop Gabriel von Eichstädt; ‘a large number of the clergy are exempt; the canons of the chapter will not submit to the bishop’s authority in anything; the superiors of the cloisters also appeal to their privileges and immunities, and profess utter astonishment when a word of restraint is spoken to them; parish priests and their assistants learn from secular councillors all sorts of subterfuges by which they elude our control. The dearth of good priests grows greater and greater.² Ever since the

¹ Winter, i. 310–315. See also our statements, vol. ii. 342, German, vol. iv. 19, Eng. trans.

² ‘*Plures ecclesiae*,’ wrote Kilian Leib in 1533, ‘in nostra Eystettensi aliisque diocesisibus non potuerunt habere pastores, sic sancta in dies religio deficiebat.’ Even in that part of the diocese which appeared outwardly to be loyal to the Bishop all restraints of order and discipline seemed to have collapsed. The Chapter threatened to dissolve itself; its assemblies were either not attended, or else served only as occasions of scandal from the excesses carried on at them. See Suttner’s article in

time when Lutheranism came into vogue, introducing insubordination of all sorts among the clergy and the laity, vice of every description has become rampant throughout the land ; and the priests are as bad as the rest. The clergy, who ought to be the leaders of the people, have become blind, and leaders of the blind.¹ But, however much Gabriel lamented the way in which the bishops were handicapped, he nevertheless attributed to their own ‘ scandalous neglect’ the chief part of the blame of the melancholy state of things. ‘ I greatly fear,’ he said once to Kilian Leib, ‘ that Lutheranism is a plague sent by God, because we bishops are doing nothing. I have spoken repeatedly on the subject to this and that bishop, but it is of no use, they take nothing to heart.’²

In Bavaria, as elsewhere, it was the cathedral canons who caused the worst scandal in the Church. These dignitaries were recruited chiefly from the ranks of the grossly degenerated nobility ; they were for the most part men devoid of learning or culture, and the majority of them were not even ordained priests, but ‘ secular men of war,’ whose profligate lives were chiefly to blame for the contempt in which the ecclesiastical order was held by the people.³ ‘ What labour it will cost to reform the cathedral churches,’ the theologian John Eck wrote on March 13, 1540, to Contarini,

the *Eichstädter Pastoralblatt*, Jahrgang 1870, p. 171. As in the diocese of Eichstätt, so it was almost everywhere.

¹ *Curieuse Nachrichten*, p. 87.

² Suttner, p. 177.

³ See the letter of Peter Canisius to the Cardinal Commendone in Reiffenberg, *Mant. Dipl.* 46. It was the habit of these canons to receive the revenues of their offices and to delegate their functions to curates not belonging to the nobility. Hence arose the saying : ‘ The curates go to church for the canons, the canons go to hell for the curates.’ Schwarz, *Briefe und Acten*, 2, xlix. and 66.

‘especially those where the canons are all nobles ! For out of 24, 30, or 40 of these worthies, there are barely five or six who are priests. I know one cathedral church where, out of 54 canons, only three are priests.’ ‘Within the last few days I have come to know of another one where neither the bishop, nor the provost, nor the dean, belong to the order of the priesthood. Some of the canons never pray ; others seldom appear in the choir ; none of them concern themselves about theological studies.’¹ It was represented to Duke William IV. of Bavaria, by a provincial synod held at Salzburg in 1549, that the principal cause of the moral corruption among the higher ecclesiastics was the exclusion of the burgher class from the canonicates and other higher clerical posts.²

The Duke’s delegates on this occasion said emphatically that ‘the decrees of the synod would be utterly fruitless, if, first and foremost, the morals of the clergy were not improved ; for irregular living was the parent of heresy.’ How urgently reform in this direction was needed by the lower clergy also is best seen from a petition in which a number of Bavarian country clergymen appealed to the synod for permission to retain their concubines.³ ‘John Eck complained in 1540 that concubinage had gained ground almost everywhere, and that the clergy often marry their concubines, as if they could become legitimate wives ; that a great many of the clergy, who were secretly tainted with heresy, no longer observed any of the Church rules of fasting and abstinence, no longer

¹ Raynald, ad annum 1540, No. 8.

² Sugenheim, *Baierns Zustände*, p. 97, note 16.

³ Winter, ii. 160, 162-163.

paid any heed to the breviary prayers, and, owing to the lamentable dearth and inefficiency of Church schools, were often preposterously ignorant of the simplest articles of faith.' It is recorded that in the year 1558 the abbot of Fürstenzell could not even 'say how many sacraments there were.' 'He has a dancing-hall and a tavern in the cloister grounds,' we read in an inspectorial protocol, 'but no school.'¹ What the Dominican, John Fabri, had said of Colmar in 1540 was equally applicable to Bavaria: 'The harvest is ready but the labourers are few.' 'The monks use the outward practice of religion for purposes of avarice, and forget to cultivate poverty of spirit and mercy towards the poor.'²

There were, however, some good cloisters here and there; for instance, the Benedictine monastery of Metten, which was under the charge of several pious and excellent abbots, and where the monks, since the beginning of the 16th century, had shown great zeal in enriching their library and cultivating learning. The Protestant writer, Caspar Bruschius, calls the abbot Wolfgang (1526–1535) a pious man much given to prayer, and he gives high praise to his successor Carl (1535–1537) for his blameless life and his zealous devotion to learning.³ 'But,' writes John Eck, 'well-regulated cloisters are growing fewer and fewer, as indeed are also good priests and monks, for the number of men who take Holy Orders and go into monasteries is rapidly decreasing. In many cases, too, heresy has found advocates inside monastic walls, and if these apostates were not restrained by secular authority, many of the monks

¹ Sugenheim, p. 165, note 178.

² Rocholl, pp. 54–55.

³ Mittermüller, pp. 124–126.

would marry and divide the abbey property among them, and would justify such a proceeding as a fruit of the Gospel and call it good evangelical behaviour.'

Among the common people also, religious life was dwindling down. At a provincial assembly at Landshut in 1553, the growing impiety of the peasants came under discussion, and it was stated that they frequently destroyed crosses and images of the saints, and that the Holy Mass was treated with contempt by them.¹ The sacrament of penance and pilgrimages had also fallen into contempt with many people, especially among the nobles.² On one occasion a priest, who was making a pilgrimage to Altötting with a cross, was attacked and fatally injured. It seemed as though 'a state of deadly lethargy would set in in Bavaria ; for piety, church-going, pilgrimages, and all that was godly and Christian, was either little cared for or altogether neglected.'³ At a Corpus Christi procession at Augsburg, one year, there were not more than twenty people present ; the Catholic youth were in the habit of attending Protestant schools, and thus they grew up in the new faith.⁴

Under the rule of the phlegmatic Duke Albert V., who succeeded his father William IV. in 1550, the number of new religionists in Bavaria went on increasing.⁵

¹ Freyberg, *Landstände*, ii. 318.

² Meichelbeck, *Chron. Benedicto-Buranum*, i. 258.

³ Hemmauer, *Histor. Entwurf des Closters Ober-Altaich*. p. 329.

⁴ Agricola, i. 69.

⁵ Concerning the religious attitude of Albrecht V. opinions are wide asunder. Knöpfler's estimate of him (*Kelchbewegung &c.*) is certainly much too favourable (compare Schlecht in the *Hist. Jahrb.* xiii. 626 f.) ; that of Stieve, on the other hand (*Allgem. Zeitung*, 1892, Beilage, No. 38), much too disparaging. Götz (*Maximilian II's Wahl*, 79-80, 124) maintains firmly, in opposition to Knöpfler, that Albert V. was for a length of time in a wavering frame of mind. Paulus has clearly shown

If the Duke had hoped to lead the wanderers back more easily by instruction and lenity than by force and coercion, he must soon have recognised the futility of such an endeavour. His forbearance had the opposite effect ; the spirit of innovation spread deeper and wider

in the *Katholik*, 1896, i. 576 f. that the account contributed by Gaudentius, i. 61, is purely fabulous. The much needed work of a more accurate investigation into the truth of this corner of history has been lately undertaken by Riezler in the *Angriff*. In his very valuable article, ‘Zur Würdigung Herzog Albrechts V. von Bayern und seiner inneren Regierung’ (*Abhandlungen der Münchener Akad.* xxi. section 1, p. 98 f.), he maintains—in opposition to Knöpfler, whom, however, he does not mention—that in Albert’s Church policy we must distinguish between two separate sections. ‘From the time when he became permeated by the influence of the Jesuits, and was roused by the behaviour of the Protestants among his nobles at the provincial assembly of 1563, and still more by the injurious tone and the suspicious contents of their letters, found in Mattigkofen (in 1564), his policy was strenuously Catholic, and as such clear and consistent. On the other hand, this quality of decision is entirely wanting in his Church policy throughout the first decade of his sovereignty, and consequently the judgments of modern authors on the Duke’s attitude at that period are wavering and uncertain.’ Riezler goes on to reject the opinion of K. Preger (*Paneraz von Freyberg*, p. 21) that Albert was half a patron of the new doctrine, and asserts, in contradiction to Ranke (*Popes*, ii. 9), that at no stage of his life did Albert show any inclination towards the new religion. At the same time he holds firmly to the opinion that ‘Albert was a lukewarm and superficial Catholic.’ In a spirit of partial agreement with Riezler, W. Götz, in his *Bayerische Politik im ersten Jahrzehnt der Regierung Herzog Albrechts V von Bayern*, 1550–1560 (Munich, 1896), has lately examined into these questions. Götz presents a very unfavourable view of Albert V. ‘He was neither a statesman nor a general ; on the whole, not a commanding personality, but, all the same, a useful disciple of his councillors. We should nevertheless be going too far if we pronounced Duke Albert a mere passive instrument of his surroundings ; a long time elapses before he finds councillors in perfect agreement with his nature. Phlegmatic conservatism is the groundwork of his being ; of inner evolution there are few traces. It is only when the events that happen around him affect his personal interest, or the interest of his dynasty, that he bothers himself about them.’ Götz then polemises against the opposite views of the Duke, and concludes as follows : ‘In spite of these attempts at vindication the figure of Albert V. remains a very uninteresting one. It is quite different, however, with Bavarian policy in his time ; it has system and

the more the old measures of sternness and watchfulness were relaxed.

At Munich several members of the town council proclaimed themselves decided adherents of the new religion.¹ At Straubing the council appointed a school-master who had studied at Wittenberg, and who, according to a visitation report, ‘was inoculated through and through with the poisonous doctrines ;’² ‘sectarian tracts, scurrilous pamphlets, and lampoons against the Catholic religion and the Pope, who was depicted as Antichrist with devil’s claws, against the bishops as devil’s menials, and the Holy Mass as a dragon’s tail, were circulated broadcast and read in all directions, in spite of the ducal prohibition ; and many burghers in different towns were infected by these publications, and made no secret of the fact that they had gone over to the new faith and would have nothing more

development, and in it all those elements which make that period of history so fascinating, recur again and again. . . . This Bavarian policy is, in all its essential features, the work of the ducal councillors ; it is therefore to their history that we must go first for enlightenment on the subject. Hitherto the life of Albert V. has been divided into two sections, separated by the year 1563. The following presentation of the case attempts to prove that the beginning of the second period, distinguished by its strong Catholic policy, must not be placed after the events of 1563, but that it was already in a state of incipience in the first decade of Duke Albert’s reign, and that it is only the inevitable outcome of this first period.’ Brandi (*Hist. Zeitschr.* lxxvii. 297) sets the seal of assent to Götz’s conclusions when he says: ‘Not a wavering to and fro between Catholicism and “fits of evangelicalism” such as Ranke still detected in him, still less a sudden change of polities after the experiences of the movement of the nobility in 1563, but a slow process of reconciliation to Austria, and a natural attachment to the leading representative of Catholicism in Europe, Philip of Spain. Although, on the whole, these changes corresponded to the character and views of Albert V., the responsibility for each in particular rests with his advisers rather than with himself.’

¹ Sugenheim, 50 f.

² Westenrieder, *Calender für 1801*, p. 216.

to do with the jugglery and seduction of the old religion.¹ Some even of the Duke's court officials were adherents of the new faith; for instance, the marshal of his household, Pancras von Freyberg, and the ducal house-stewards (Truchsesses) Achaz von Laymingen and Hieronymus von Seiboltsdorf; also several of the principal territorial nobles, with the counts of Ortenburg and Haag at their head.²

At a provincial assembly which met at the end of 1553, the temporal Estates petitioned the Duke to allow the Sacrament to be administered in both kinds and 'the evangel' to be preached; and, although Albert rejected the petition, several of the nobles proceeded to eject the Catholic priests and to appoint Lutheran preachers. The owners of the Lordship of Brennberg, in the district of Straubing, drove the Benedictines out of the monastery of Frauenzell, and nominated Protestant laymen as administrators of the monastery property. 'The noble lords of Bavaria were desirous of emulating their brothers in Austria.' Oswald von Eck, a son of the chancellor who had played so important a part under Duke William IV., was a 'mighty drinker, and once, at a carousal, he called the ecclesiastical possessions 'a sweet evangelical dish'; the Duke, he said, should transport the 'chief part of them into his kitchen, and the nobles would still have plenty of crumbs left over for themselves.'

At the provincial assembly of 1556, a committee of nobles and burghers renewed the petition respecting

¹ *Jammer &c.* Bl. 3^b.

² Concerning Pancraz von Freyberg, see the monograph of Preger (Halle, 1893), who, however, is mistaken in attributing to him any influence over the Duke and his court in religious matters. See Götz, *Albrecht V.*, p. 96, note.

the Eucharist, and made a further demand for the abolition of the celibacy of priests and the fasting rules; not till these points had been conceded, they said, would they grant the required supplies of money. Their language was so defiant that Albert again reproved them for their 'presumption and insolence.'

In order to obtain the subsidies, Albert, in March 1556, issued an edict in which, regardless of the ecclesiastical law, he promised to concede the lay chalice and the eating of meat on fast days to the nobles and to their subjects, but with the reservation that no priest was to be constrained either by threats or by violence to administer the Sacrament in both kinds. It was his wish, he said, that this matter should be left to the conscience of each priest, for 'he did not think that a clergyman should be coerced or punished in this respect.'¹

But he found later on, as he wrote to Archduke Ferdinand, that 'If one gives these people an inch they want an ell.'²

The very next year, the Protestant members of the Estates, in direct contradiction to the demand for freedom of conscience previously made by them, required of the Duke that he would issue a formal injunction to the priests to administer the Sacrament in both kinds. And this time also the demand was accompanied by a threat of refusal of subsidies. Albert promised to send a special deputation, headed by the Count of Ortenburg, to discuss the question of the Eucharist with the bishops. The latter, however,

¹ Freyberg, *Landstände*, ii. 329; Mannert, *Gesch. Bayerns*, ii. 53. See Aretin, *Maximilian*, pp. 72-82; Maurenbrecher, pp. 14-15. See Knöpfler, *Kelchbewegung*, pp. 19 f.

² Aretin, *Maximilian*, p. 223.

declared that this question must await the decision of the council, and meanwhile forbade the administration in both kinds. ‘One error after another,’ they said, had arisen from the concession of the lay chalice. ‘Some of the priests had taken to consecrating the elements without the Mass being said, and were also in the habit of administering the Sacrament without previous confession. Others had taught that the body only was present in the bread, the blood only in the wine, and that each element was only half of the Sacrament; others even said the bread and wine were only symbols.’

‘Among the ministers and other officials of the Church,’ wrote the Duke, ‘there are Lutherans, Zwinglians, Flacians, and Anabaptists; some of them are reviving the doctrines of the Manicheans, others again those of the Eunomians: it is scarcely possible to root up all the noxious weeds of heresy.’¹ Again, in a public document of July 29, 1558, Duke Albert said, ‘Persons of all classes and conditions, both male and female, set themselves up to preach and declaim, either secretly in private houses, or openly at public meetings, in taverns, in market places, and even in churches, against their own preachers and pastors, and to speak with derision of our most holy Sacraments and of all the principal articles of our Christian faith, disputing about them, slandering and reviling them, and pouring out blasphemous and venomous attacks on them all over the land.’²

We learn from the reports of a church visitation

¹ Arctin, *Maximilian*, pp. 82 ff.; Huschberg, p. 370; Wolf, *Maximilian*, i. 19 ff.

² Huschberg, p. 371, note 1.

held in the years 1558 and 1559 how terribly morals had degenerated. Most of the secular clergy were found to be living in open concubinage. Many of them refused to recognise more than two sacraments. In a large number of districts, owing to the negligence of the bishops, the Sacrament of Confirmation had not been administered within the memory of the inhabitants. The number of those who kept away entirely from the Eucharist had augmented from year to year. The populace had become ‘barbarous and uncivilised.’

One cleric relates that when he went across country he was obliged to carry a musket, for ‘he was surrounded by wicked people;’ another, ‘while reading Mass, had several times been dragged down from the altar and his chalice had been irreverently handled by the people.’ In several parishes it was found that many of the inhabitants had not attended church for eight or ten years.¹ The author of a pamphlet of the year 1559 writes: ‘I have heard more than one pastor complain that very few men attend the Sunday church services; the congregations generally consist of a few women and children. At the Easter Communions, to which formerly many hundreds flocked, scarcely eight or ten are now present.’ ‘One person told us, with tears in his eyes, that a parish priest, who was carrying the Eucharist to a sick person, was stripped of his vestments, dragged about, and pelted with dirt, and that the offenders went unpunished. Another, while preaching about the dear Mother of God, had a stone flung at his head, which proceeding raised a roar of vulgar laughter. At Schärding, some years ago, on

¹ Fuller details in the protocols in Sugenheim, pp. 53–55. See Aretin, *Maximilian*, pp. 86–88. See Knöpfler, *Kelchbewegung*, pp. 42 ff.

holy Easter day, a great barrel of beer had been emptied in the church, and the pastor's house set fire to because he would not preach the evangelical doctrine of the resurrection of the body: that was the point. If he preached of confession, they would hack him, saying all that sort of thing was done away with, and they wouldn't have popish jugglery foisted on them.¹ 'Instead of church going, confession, and fasting,' the reporter adds, 'there is everywhere nothing but eating and drinking, blasphemy, adultery, and murder; lawless, disorderly, dissolute living prevails in all directions, and the commands and punishments of the ruling authorities are powerless against it all. For there is no longer any fear of God or of law among men, and this evangelical freedom, of which they prate, is a cloak for every kind of vice.'¹

A similar state of things prevailed in the archbishopric of Salzburg, which lay enclosed between Austria and Bavaria. Respecting the life of the Archbishop Michael of Khüenburg (†1560), 'nothing but good was said.' Michael was 'a blameless, excellent man, a benefactor of the poor, especially of students.'² His predecessor, Ernest of Bavaria (†1554), on the other hand, had never received Holy Orders and was secretly married to a young lady of the lower nobility. There is mention also of an illegitimate son of his.³

Here too, as in Bavaria and elsewhere, the cathedral canons came in for a large share of blame. The testimony of a morality preacher in 1559 is as follows:

¹ *Jammer d.c.* Bl. vii. 10.

² Wolf *Geschichtl. Bilder*, pp. 176-177.

³ Wiedemann, *Geschichte der Reformation*, ii. 333; Paulus in *Hist. Jahrb.* xv. 583, note 3.

‘The canons are for the most part members of the upper nobility, warlike, turbulent men ; they scorn to enter into the ecclesiastical state, and look with contempt on the whole body of the clergy ; they are seldom or never seen in the choir, but are frequent attendants at banquets, and a goodly number of them, as they themselves have been heard to say, are quite ready to take unto themselves wives and to secede from the Catholic faith.’¹ These canons had got nearly the whole ecclesiastical government into their own hands ; the Archbishop of Salzburg, like the bishops of Vienna, were nonentities. Among the inferior clergy, who were mere puppets of the higher nobles, there were ‘scandals without end.’ Many of the clergy ‘insisted upon having wives, refused to hear confession, and to administer extreme unction to the sick.’ ‘Those of the Church patrons, who were members of the nobility, thought to better themselves by confiscating the Church property in their possession.’² ‘The leading burghers of Salzburg,’ writes a contemporary chronicler, ‘despise the Mass and do not go to confession, but repair to the nearest Lutheran conventicle to perform their so-called worship ; they engage sectarian instructors for their children, and send their sons to Lutheran gymnasiums, so that only a small number of the burghers of Salzburg are Catholics.’ It was ‘to be apprehended’ that the whole of the archbishopric would become Lutheran. ‘The population had little to do with their priests in religious matters.’ ‘Out of thousands and more inhabitants belonging to the same parish, scarcely twenty or thirty were to be seen in church on Sundays,

¹ *Jammer d.c.* Bl. 8^b.

² *Ibid.* Bl. 9-10.

and on feast days nobody was present besides the curator, the judge, and the sacristan.¹ When the Archbishop of Salzburg was invited to the council, he excused himself on the plea that ‘he dared not travel on account of the dangerous state of his diocese ; many of the people, especially the mining population, harboured a secret spirit of heresy, in addition to which, plots had lately been discovered in the Tyrol for massacring all the priests and nobles.’²

The Franconian bishoprics of Bamberg and Würzburg were ‘filled with sectarian preachers,’ and the nobles ‘boldly declared that a daring game must be played ; the bishops must be transformed into temporal princes, and the lords of the nobility must be invested with hereditary fiefs out of the Church and convent property, and they would then appoint preachers of the pure faith.’ Already, wherever they could, these lords were unscrupulously appropriating ecclesiastical emoluments, and the property of Church institutions, and robbing the poor either in part or in whole of endowments intended for their benefit.³ The letters of the Jesuit Canisius are full of complaints of the scandalous lives of the Bamberg and Würzburg clergy. The conditions of public life, he said, were altogether anarchical ; the Bishop of Würzburg did not dare leave his castle, or enter his cathedral, without a military guard. Very few of the Franconian nobles were still Catholics.

In the diocese of Fulda also ‘many preachers of different sects were at work among the knights,’ and ‘they met with hardly any opposition from the clergy.’

¹ From *Steinhausers Beschreibung der Reformation*, in Wolf, *Geschichtl. Bilder*, pp. 177-179.

² Bucholtz, viii. 415.

³ Jammer &c. Bl. 12.

They complained openly that they were very badly treated by their patrons, the knights, who had appropriated the Church goods and endowments, and that the churches, for want of revenues, were falling into decay and often looked like pig-sties; as for themselves, they said, they received such meagre pittances that they and their families were almost paupers; and if they (the pastors) died, their wives and children would be reduced to begging. Added to all this, the people in many places were thoroughly refractory and treated their clergy as though they were the most contemptible of men; they did not care for sermons or sacraments; there were no schools, and the people were left to grow up like cattle.¹ The prince-abbots, menaced continually by the Landgrave of Hesse, had ‘been obliged to let things take their course.’ Even in the town of Fulda ‘evil influences had prevailed to such an extent that, under the rule of the abbots Wolfgang and William (†1570), the burghers had risen in defiance and peremptorily demanded the abolition of the Catholic worship and the introduction of the Augsburg Confession.’²

The district of the Eichsfeld, in the archbishopric of Mayence, especially was ‘so entirely in the hands of the subversive innovators, that there were very few traces of the Catholic faith left.’ In many places the new Gospel was introduced by means of ‘spears and muskets.’ ‘The nobles have the audacity,’ we read in an archiepiscopal memorandum, ‘to take forcible

¹ Quoted in the *Christenlichen Ermahnungen an die lieben Teutschen* (1571), Bl. ii. 5.

² From the *Geschichte des Fuldaer Jesuitencollegs*, in Komp, *Zweite Schule*, p. 7.

possession of the churches of the Eichsfeld, to assume ecclesiastical control, and to appoint strange preachers according to their own taste ; they resort to all manner of wicked devices, libellous tracts and so forth, and even to violence and coercion, to turn their poor subjects and vassals from the Catholic faith, which they and their fathers have professed for ages, and to get the Church goods into their own hands.'¹ Here, too, the unblushing profligacy of the clergy, the regular clergy especially, was chiefly to blame for the general falling off from the faith.² Of the monastic clergy at Erfurt, Melchior von Ossa said in his diary in 1554 : 'They conduct themselves in their pothouses in a way that even Turks and heathens would be ashamed of. Their behaviour in the choir shows no spirit of devotion ; they talk and chatter together and pay no attention to the lessons read from Holy Scripture ; they think no more of spiritual doctrine than of apples and pears ; many clerics have been heard to say that sooner than let themselves be reformed they would become Lutherans.'³

Christopher of Stadion, Bishop of Augsburg, a prelate most eager for reform, told the papal nuncio, Morone, in 1542, that it was the licence allowed in the Lutheran Church which encouraged and supported the clergy in their wicked sensuality.⁴ And again,

¹ Wolf, *Eichsfeld*, pp. 172-181.

² Compare, for instance, the 'Reformatio Ecclesiae Collegiatæ ad S. Martinum Heiligenstadii,' ordered in 1550 by Archb. Sebastian von Heusenstamm (Wolf, *Eichsfeld*, pp. 80-86). The charge mentions 'perpotationes, scortationes, concubinatus, rixæ, contentiones.' As regards the state of the episcopal town, Worms, see Cornely, p. 76 ; Riess, p. 207.

³ Von Langenn, *Melchior von Ossa*, pp. 154-155.

⁴ Laemmer, *Mon. Vatic.* p. 402. See, p. 412, the remarks of the Cardinal-Archbishop of Mayence.

in 1560, John von der Leyen, Archbishop of Treves, wrote to the Cologne Jesuit, John of Reidt, that the latent Protestantism among those who still kept up an outward show of orthodoxy was ‘enormously more injurious to the Catholic Church and people than was open apostasy.’¹

In the year 1559, at the Diet of Augsburg, the Emperor Ferdinand told the Ecclesiastical Estates that ‘moral and physical evils of all sorts reached a far higher pitch in the present day (people being so negligent of reform) than in the days of our ancestors when the Church did not suffer nearly so much from assaults and contrarieties. ‘In the cloisters,’ he said, ‘which formerly were models of Christian order and discipline, we too often find dishonesty, scandal and vice, and such disorderly, disgraceful household management, that the funds were all squandered in wanton waste and luxury, and the needy poor defrauded of what was theirs by right.’ ‘And thus the funds are made to serve purposes directly opposed to those intended by the pious founders. And the worst of it all is that pious, worthy priests and monks often suffer for the wicked ones, and have to endure all kinds of gruesome, inhuman treatment on their account.’

‘Parishes and livings,’ the Emperor goes on, ‘are so lamentably cut down and impoverished, that good efficient priests, who would preach the Word of God to the people and administer the Sacraments, are extremely difficult to obtain. And those we have can no longer keep hunger and misery from their doors, and are thus reduced to apostatising and going off to any place which will make them welcome.’ ‘The schools also, both

¹ Despatch of Dec. 27, 1560. See above, p. 40, note 3.

public and private, are going to ruin all over Germany ; for there is neither help nor counsel at hand for them. And' much excellent ability and talent is wasted in consequence, for some are too poor to carry on their education independently, while others, who have both the means and the will to study, cannot procure efficient instructors. Added to all which there is the great and crying evil that those who would be only too glad to devote themselves diligently to learning, above all to the study of the Holy Scriptures, have little or nothing to look forward to at the end of their training : either no income at all, or the barest pittance.' 'Thus the seed which ought to produce servants of the Church is utterly wasted and destroyed.'

'Owing to the fault of the clergy,' there were many places in Catholic districts where the Catholic religion, the only true and right one, was not properly cared for, and others where it was altogether disregarded ; and encouragement was thus given to the populace 'not only to fall away from their holy religion, but also to treat the clergy with contempt and contumely.' 'We are at our wits' end,' said Ferdinand, 'we and our other Catholic Estates, to know how to keep our subjects in anything like Christian discipline, in these days when the nation has become so uncouth and uncivilised, and the way of salvation is made so broad and easy ; in sorrow we are condemned to look on, while our people grow more and more unruly and wanton.'¹

'The heresy which stalks abroad throughout Germany,' says a contemporary Catholic writer, 'is a judgment of an angry God ; through our own infirmities it gains strength daily. So long as there is no improve-

¹ Bucholtz, vii. 432-435.

ment in the morals of the clergy, so long will there be no end to sectarianism, and no rest in the dioceses.'¹

While the question of imperatively needed reform was being discussed at the Diet of Augsburg between the Emperor and the Ecclesiastical Estates, a disturbance of a most serious and extensive nature had occurred at Treves. 'Had the agitators succeeded in their intentions,' wrote the Archbishop, 'an important initial measure, as we learn from exact information, would have been to push on further into the Rhenish *Pfaffengasse*, and by degrees, as the apostates said, bring the whole of that region under the sway of the Gospel.' 'A by no means insignificant portion of the clergy there are secretly apostates from the Catholic faith; they despise all Church rules and ordinances, and in their criminal sinfulness actually threaten that, if they are not allowed to marry, they will openly abandon the Church. Among these renegades the agitators find many secret adherents, and the agitation has made considerable way in adjacent bishoprics.'²

The author of this disturbance was one Caspar Olevian, a native of Treves, and teacher of grammar and other branches of secular learning at the school 'zur Burse' (bursars' or endowed school) who had long been a Calvinist at heart, and who on August 10, during the absence of the Archbishop and his councillors at the Diet of Augsburg, had begun openly preaching the heretical doctrines which he had long held secretly. He declaimed 'with terrible vehemence against the saints, the Holy Sacrament of the Altar, pilgrimages and other things,' says an eye-witness, the town clerk Dronkmann; his preaching 'could serve no other end

¹ Bucholtz, vii. 435, note.

² Despatch cited at p. 185, note 1.

than to stir up tumult.' 'On account of the uproar he had raised, and because he had behaved in a manner at variance with his calling,' the magistrate inhibited Olevian from appearing again as a preacher.¹

But by the management of one of the burgomasters, Peter Steuss, and three town councillors, two of whom had received letters from Calvin the year before, it was settled that the matter should be submitted to the decision of the different guilds. As had been the case under Zwingli in Switzerland, so again now, the question of religion and the right interpretation of the Scriptures was to be settled by the votes of a majority of shopkeepers and artisans. Olevian, in a circular addressed to the heads of the guilds, said that the honour of God and the salvation of souls was at stake ; that he was anxious to prove openly before them all, from the Holy Scriptures themselves, the truth of his doctrine.²

The votes of the guilds went against Olevian. Only among the weavers, the tailors, and the smiths was there a majority in his favour ; the other eleven guilds declared themselves opposed to his doctrines. The guild of shopkeepers made the following statement of opinion : ' Whereas up till now, through all Christendom, people have lived in peace and sanctity in the old religion, and now at the present day all the cities of the Empire are thrown into turmoil and unrest on account of the ancient faith, it is the will and intention of our honourable guild to petition and implore our honourable council that they will put down everything in the way of preaching and teaching, and collecting in mobs, which militates against public peace and order, so that no disturbances may occur in our town.' One of the town

¹ Marx, *Olevian*, p. 21.

² *Ibid.* pp. 120, 121, note.

councillors, Leonhard Nussbaum, protested that the question of religion must not be discussed in the council-house, especially as ‘in these troublous times, every year, indeed every month, fresh creeds were concocted.’¹

Although an enormous majority both of magistrates and guilds had pronounced against Olevian’s being allowed to go on preaching, he was not to be restrained. ‘The glory of God,’ he informed the Archbishop’s councillors, ‘was the motive that impelled him. He had no right to bury in the earth the gift bestowed upon him by God.’

‘If the game succeeds in Treves,’ said the new religionists, ‘a new road will be opened up to us in the Empire.’ Within Treves and its liberties alone there were nearly twenty institutions with founded property which, if once the Gospel gained headway there, would offer wealthy booty.²

Olevian went forward ruthlessly. As his friends said of him, he was ‘an evangelical firebrand,’ and even Theodore Beza felt compelled in later years to warn him against excessive zeal and vehemence. For the present the chief thing was to make out that his proceedings were based on justifiable grounds, and for this purpose his adherents sent the magistrate a manifesto in which, on the strength of the Augsburg Religious Peace, they claimed for the burghers of Treves free and unlimited right to regulate their religious practices by the Augsburg Confession.³

As a matter of fact, however, this right was really annulled by the Religious Peace. Even if the whole body of magistrates and all the guilds had been in favour

¹ Marx, *Olevian*, pp. 21–25.

² *Ibid.* p. 129, note 2.

³ Hontheim, ii. 784.

of the Augsburg Confession, according to the clear wording of the Peace of Augsburg, they would have had no right to frame their religious practice according to it. For, by the terms of the Peace, this right had only been granted to those of the secular Estates who held fiefs immediately from the Empire ; Treves was not an imperial city, but had stood for centuries under the suzerainty of the electors. As late as February 28, 1559, the magistrate had said in a memorandum to the Imperial Chamber : ‘ Treves, as everybody knows, is not an immediate fief of the Empire.’¹

The Elector was by no means willing to allow any curtailment of the rights accorded him by the Religious Peace. Nevertheless, his stern inhibition of ‘ evangelical’ preaching remained without effect. Not only did Olevian continue his propagandist work among the people, but a second preacher, Cunman Flinsbach, was brought from Zweibrücken, and this man declared plainly that he should go on with his preaching in spite of all prohibition. In opposition to the decision of the town council some of its members assigned these preachers a church which ‘ was the property of the town and the whole company of burghers.’ Olevian and Flinsbach were protected by an armed force and accompanied to the pulpit by an armed escort.²

When the Elector returned from the Diet, an insurrection was on the point of breaking out. He had come to Treves, so he informed the Landgrave Philip, in the hope of being able to bring back to submission the turbulent and refractory citizens who had stirred up sedition in defiance of the secular and religious peace.

¹ Hontheim, ii. 856.

² Report of the magistrate, Nov. 18, 1559, in Hontheim, ii. 822-829.

‘These demagogues, however, regardless of his presence, had barricaded the gates and streets in a revolutionary manner, and had shown such a spirit of rebellion that he and his retinue had been in no slight danger of their lives.’ One of the Elector’s preachers had been insulted in the pulpit and with difficulty rescued from the maltreatment of the innovators. ‘We will pass over the odious details,’ said the Elector, ‘of the manner in which this so-called preacher’ (the Calvinist Olevian) ‘has dared openly from the pulpit to assail ourselves and our Estates, our clergy, officials, and loyal burghers, with scurrilous libels and pasquils, in the most abominable manner, in opposition to all the articles, both profane and religious, of the Peace of Augsburg.’ ‘Day and night,’ wrote the town council, ‘the sedition-mongers rampage about the streets, armed and accoutred, and declaring in threatening tones, “Our creed must be established even if no stone should be left standing.”’¹

Finally, by command of the Elector, Olevian and eleven men of his party, the ringleaders of the movement, were taken prisoners on October 11, 1559.

Although it was expressly stated in the terms of the Religious Peace that ‘No one of the princes must forcibly compel any of the others, or their subjects, to embrace his own religion, or in any way to protect or defend any subjects in revolt against their rulers,’ the Palatine Elector Frederic III. had promised the preacher Flinsbach, on his departure for Treves, to give him full support in case of any proceedings being instituted against him by the lord of the territory.²

¹ Neudecker, *Neue Beiträge*, i. 203–206. Report of the town council in Hontheim, ii. 822–829.

² Fuller details in Marx, *Olevian*, pp. 49–62.

Immediately on the imprisonment of the Confessionists, Frederic III. sent a deputation to Treves, and delegates soon followed from the Dukes Christopher of Würtemberg and Wolfgang of Zweibrücken, from the Landgrave Philip and from two other Lutheran princes, to whom the Treves Confessionists had appealed for help. The delegates demanded that the prisoners should be released, that they should be allowed to adhere to their Confession, and that a church should be assigned to them with the right of appointing preachers. ‘All this,’ said the Catholic party, ‘was very extraordinary from the mouths of princes who had nothing so much at heart as to root out all traces of Catholicism, wherever their jurisdiction extended, and who based their “sacred right” to do this on the terms of the Religious Peace. But his Electoral Grace of Treves, who has precisely the same right as they have to dictate the religion of his subjects, gave them a fitting answer.’ Fortunately for the Elector of Treves, the delegates of the Lutheran princes came to the conclusion that ‘Calvinism was at the bottom of the business, and with that they would not be mixed up.’ They had discovered, they said, that these Confessionists, under the cloak of the Augsburg Confession, ‘had set many dangerous movements going, in violation of the Peace of Augsburg: in especial they had attempted to exercise suzerain and mediate authority, and had appointed Calvinistic preachers.’¹

Peace was at last restored. The preachers and the rest of the prisoners were ordered out of the town by the Elector and the magistrate, and all other ‘Con-

¹ Marx, *Olevian*, pp. 63–65.

fessionists' also, who refused to return to the old religion, were admonished to leave Treves. The number of banished persons amounted in all to 35.¹

But, though the 'storm had quieted down for the moment,' the Elector, who could not expect any help from the other Catholic Estates, was in constant fear of internal commotion and of the interference of neighbouring Protestant princes. 'The Protestants,' he said to the papal nuncio, Commendone, in May 1561, 'are not satisfied with the Religious Peace of Augsburg, although its terms are very disadvantageous to the Catholics; they do not respect its conditions themselves, although they would compel the Catholics to do so, and they are always endeavouring to stretch the treaty in their own favour.' From fear of disturbances he did not dare absent himself from his archbishopric, for he would not leave his church and his people exposed to certain danger, and to calamities from which it would be impossible to recover.²

Commendone, who travelled over Germany at that time on his papal mission, reports from personal observation on the hopeless condition of things, which gave reason to fear the complete downfall of the Catholic faith.

'The number of heretics,' he writes, 'increases from day to day; not only have they won over to their side the majority of the secular princes, but their poison has polluted the lands of all the Catholic princes, ecclesiastical as well as secular, so that the lords of

¹ In the imperial city of Aachen (Aix-la-Chapelle) the Catholic measures of defence were as successful as at Treves. Interesting accounts of these are contained in unpublished acts at Vienna, Düsseldorf, and Marburg, in Ritter, i. 221 f.

² Reimann, *Sendung des Nuntius Commendone*, p. 263.

territories can scarcely obtain any services from their subjects, or command their obedience, or get possession of the taxes due to them.' 'Amazing alike are the watchfulness of the Protestant princes and the lethargy of the Catholics. One would think from all appearances that our party was the one which trusts only to faith without works, so little do we bestir ourselves to remedy the existing evils and abuses. The Protestants, on the other hand, although they are outside the pale of truth, and cannot therefore attain to any real unity, do nevertheless seek to help and support each other and to make a show, at least, of agreement.' It was not only inertness, however, which hindered the Catholics from action, but also fear. 'The Catholic princes do not dare show themselves, and are becoming quite habituated to endure much contrariety.' 'Unless an attempt be made to rally the Catholics together and to rouse them from the state of fear and servility into which they have fallen, the condition of things in the domain of religion must, it seems to me, become almost hopeless.'

This is owing especially to the state of affairs in the bishoprics. 'Many of the prelates,' Commendone goes on, 'have only one single Catholic councillor or servant, and they know not on whom they may place reliance; many of them actually keep very extreme Protestants in their service, in order to make use of them, as occasion arises, in their negotiations with Protestant princes.'

'The practice of electing, or nominating for election, avowed heretics or merely neutral persons, of whom there are so many in Germany, makes it utterly hopeless that the Catholic Church will ever be helped up again,

or even that the bishops and chapters will be kept in true submission to the Apostolic See; the result, indeed, is that in many churches the canons have no scruples in openly declaring themselves heretics. Some, in doing this, are actuated solely by ambition to become prelates; for they see that they cannot be elected without the good-will of the princes, and that only heretics can secure this good-will. The chapters have already made it a rule to hand over the administration of ecclesiastical property to the newly elected prelates before they have received papal confirmation. The result is that less importance is beginning to be attached to this confirmation. Many, indeed, could not apply for it at all if it were not that their creditors, and those who own Church property, make use of this omission against the elected persons, and require them to produce their warrants of confirmation. But it is to be feared that the heretics will find a way even out of this difficulty.¹

Such was the condition of things in the imperial dominions which were still under Catholic or semi-Catholic rule at the time when Pope Pius IV. was negotiating with the Emperor and the other Catholic powers concerning the reopening of the General Council.

¹ Reimann, *Sendung des Nuntius Commendone*, pp. 256 f.

CHAPTER X

NEGOTIATIONS FOR THE REOPENING OF THE
COUNCIL OF TRENT, 1560-1561

AFTER the close of the pontificate of Paul IV., which had been so disastrous for the Church, the cardinals, assembled in conclave, represented to the future Pope (1559) that it was his first duty to use his utmost endeavours to bring about peace between the different Christian powers, to work zealously and diligently, by means of a General Council and all other permissible agencies, for the uprooting of heresy, and to institute a reform of the whole Church and of the Roman Curia.¹ John Angelo Medici, who ascended the papal chair as Pius IV., agreed to all these conditions.²

Before his election he had an interview with the Cardinal-bishop Otto of Augsburg, who, under Paul IV. and in conjunction with the Jesuit Canisius, had long been engaged in fruitless endeavours to effect a reconciliation between the Pope and King Ferdinand, and also to bring about the reopening of the Council. Otto, on this occasion, had urged on Cardinal Medici that the future Pope must look zealously after the affairs of Germany, half of which was still Catholic; but secession from the orthodox faith went on daily, and in three or

¹ *Conventiones inter cardinales in conclavi initæ*, in Sickel, pp. 12-13.

² Raynald ad a. 1559, No. 37, 38. See Müller, *Das Conclave Pius IV* (Gotha, 1889), pp. 100 f.

four years the Empire might be entirely won over by Protestantism if help and encouragement were not given by the Apostolic See. John Angelo had answered : ‘ As to what concerns you Germans, it will be necessary to convene a council, in order to see whether any concessions can be made in the matters of the marriage of the clergy and the lay chalice ; a good Pope will not fail to do what he can in these respects ; some way of help, doubt it not, will be found.’¹ Otto, on his part, was by no means of opinion that the religious difficulties could be got over by any such means as those suggested by the Cardinal, but he contented himself with expressing his ‘ heartiest satisfaction that the new Pope was so well disposed towards the Germans, so friendly towards the Emperor, and so eager for a council and for réform.’ ‘ All those whom Pope Paul IV. had somewhat exasperated by his intemperate zeal,’ wrote Otto on February 1, 1560, to his friend Duke Albert of Bavaria, ‘ the present Pope conciliates by his affability. He is kind, friendly, condescending, just, benevolent and paternal to all alike, compatriots and foreigners, friends and subjects, rich and poor ; and he is most laborious and upright.’²

In the spring of 1560 the Pope announced his intention of reopening the Council of Trent, and he despatched nuncios to negotiate the matter with the Emperor and with King Philip II. of Spain.³ The

¹ *Augustani cardinalis confessio*, in Sickel, pp. 17–18. See Vargas’s Report of Oct. 18, 1559, in Döllinger, *Beiträge*, i. 278.

² Bader, p. 130 ; see 128. Turba, *Venet. Depeschen*, iii. 135.

³ See Voss, *Die Verhandlungen Pius IV über die Neuberufung des Tridentiner Concils* (Dissertation, Leipzig, 1887), s. 32 ff., and Dembinsky in the *Verhandlungen der Krakauer Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-histor. Classe, 1891, serie ii., 2, 1 ff.

internal condition of France, where a religious schism was apprehended, called urgently for haste. Duke Albert of Bavaria, who had pronounced it necessary, on account of the Protestant Estates, to hold a Diet before the opening of the Council, wrote to Cardinal Otto on May 18 : ‘ His Holiness will not be able to put off the meeting of the Council much longer, because it is as imperatively needed by other nations as by Germany. There is no more sure and certain remedy for all impending danger than a Council. But while thus urging haste, I do not mean that it should not be well considered beforehand how we are to begin, proceed with, and conclude the business ; and I am firmly convinced, moreover, that unless we start with some sort of clear, general understanding and concert, nothing will be accomplished. I see, however, too plainly in all directions, that the evil spirit will not rest from putting obstacles and hindrances in the road, and that there is more zeal in disputing about ways and means than earnestness in grappling with the case ; and I fear that we shall go on delaying till we have lost all our opportunities, while the adversaries will find their opportunity in our tardiness and dilatoriness.’ A fresh Diet, he said, would not have the effect of bringing the Protestant Estates to the Council, ‘ for all they desire is to hinder and postpone the business ; and have we not had Diets in plenty which have had no influence whatever on these renegades ? ’¹

On May 14 the Turkish fleet off Dscherbe had almost entirely destroyed the Christian fleet ;² at Rome the worst was apprehended. ‘ His Holiness,’ Otto reported

¹ Bader, pp. 166–167.

² Hammer, *Gesch. des osmanischen Reiches*, ii. 301.

to Munich on May 20, ‘has to-day issued orders for manning the fortresses on the sea-coast; for if the Turkish armada chose, it could well bear down upon Rome. God preserve Christendom!’ The Cardinal became all the more urgent with the Duke to persuade the Emperor to hurry on the meeting of the Council. ‘The experience of many years,’ he said, ‘has shown us plainly what grievous injury and disaster have been caused, not only in the Empire, but throughout Christendom, by a perpetual policy of tacking, trimming, temporising, and condoning. Religious questions ought to be grappled with in a spirit of trust in God and not in abject fear of man; with genuine faith, unwavering hope, and dauntless courage. We must be armed with the love of God, and heartened by trust in Christ, and then no human power, and not even the might of the devil, will be able to hinder us from avenging and reasserting the glory of God. I fear nothing so much as procrastination, which will give the adversaries time to reinforce and to harden themselves still further in rebellion and obduracy.’¹

As the answers of the Emperor and the King of Spain were slow in arriving, the Pope, on June 3, summoned together the ambassadors already in Rome, with the exception of the French King’s, and informed them of his firm resolve to reassemble the Council of Trent: ‘We wish for this Council,’ he said, ‘we wish for it most certainly, and we wish it to be free and general. If we did not wish for it we might easily keep the world waiting another three or four years on the plea of the difficulty of deciding where it is to be held.’ In order to evade this difficulty, he said it was

¹ Bader, pp. 167-170.

best that the Council should at any rate reopen at Trent ; later on it might be removed to some other place which might be considered more suitable. To the Venetian ambassador the Pope made the following communication : ‘The Council is to be entirely free in its action, and its aim and object will be to improve whatever needs improving, even in matters touching our own person and interests ; but as to questions of the faith, these we intend to maintain intact, as also this our Holy See, which must continue to be the head over all, as it has been hitherto and must of necessity remain. The Council must not meet in a town which is either directly or indirectly dependent on the Church, but it must be free and unfettered, so that all may come and go without let or hindrance.’¹

But from fear of the Protestants the Emperor raised difficulties ‘which gave serious cause to fear that now again all hopes of the Council and of reform would be disappointed.’

Several of the imperial councillors—for instance, Doctor George Gienger, justiciary at Enns, a fierce opponent of the false opinions of the Councils of Constance and Basle—assumed from the outset an almost hostile attitude towards the idea of reopening the Council. In a memorandum of June 5 they represented to the Emperor that ‘In secular matters the Pope shows himself conciliatory, but in spiritual things he does not appear to recognise his duty ; he makes religion secondary to his own private interests ; his view of a Council is inadequate ; he will not agree that it should

¹ Report of the imperial ambassador of June 3, 1560, in Sickel, p. 48. See Reimann, *Unterhandlungen*, pp. 594–595 ; Ranke, *Päpste*, i. 328 ; Bucholtz, viii. 374 ; Voss, *Verhandlungen*, pp. 44 f.

be conducted according to the decrees of the Councils of Constance and Basle; possibly he does not really wish for it at heart; perhaps he wishes the Emperor to make difficulties; the King of Spain appears to be undecided; the King of France seeks only his own profit. The other kings take no interest in the matter. The clergy dislike the idea on account of the proposed reform, which they dread. The Confessionists loathe it and speak out plainly against it; it will be difficult to enforce its decrees; what the Pope will very likely propose with regard to the Confessionists is dangerous and opposed to the terms of the Religious Peace.¹ In what direction the above-mentioned Doctor Gienger, who was constantly appealed to for advice and who was a trusted friend of the Emperor's Protestant-minded son Maximilian, sought to lead the Emperor, is most clearly seen in a later memorandum where he says: 'The Emperor is only exercising his rights and fulfilling his duty when, like the Kings of Judah and the Christian Emperors from Constantine and Sigismund, he takes pity on the poor moribund Church, whose servants have abandoned true Christianity, have degenerated into abominable heathenism, and are all bent only on their own selfish ends.' 'At all costs,' he said, Ferdinand must insist on the concession of the lay chalice and the marriage of the clergy.²

Immediately after the accession of Pope Pius IV. Ferdinand had begged him to lose no time in coming to an understanding with the other Christian sovereigns

¹ Sickel, pp. 49–50.

² *Ibid.* pp. 492–493. See H. Loewe, *Die Stellung des Kaisers Ferdinand I zum Trierer Concil vom Okt. 1561 bis Mai 1562* (Inaugural Dissertation, Bonn, 1887).

concerning the summoning of a Council ;¹ but now that the Pope was proceeding in earnest to the task and was ready forthwith to issue the summons, his Imperial Majesty thought fit to admonish Pius IV. that ‘ it was not wise to be in too great a hurry, lest there should be a repetition of what had happened eight years before, when Duke Maurice had driven the Fathers assembled at Trent to seek safety in flight.’ On June 20 Ferdinand handed over to the nuncio, Stanislaus Hosius, Bishop of Ermland, a memorandum in which his opinions and wishes were stated. He began by lamenting (the present Pope of course was absolved from any blame in this respect) that a Council had not already been held at a much earlier date and long ago brought to a conclusion ; for during the past 40 years of religious schism, the Catholic religion had gone completely to the ground, and all moral probity and discipline had by degrees disappeared ; the conduct of both the clergy and the laity had become so hopelessly corrupt that it would be infinitely harder now than it would have been in earlier years to institute a Christian reform of conduct and manners. The clergy of the land especially had become so demoralised that they were little better, indeed they were too often worse, than their adversaries the Protestants. It was not enough to be Catholics in faith and heretics in practice. The proposed Council was intended for the restoration of general morality and social order, as well as for the reunion of the Church. Moreover, the question of united resistance against the Turks would also have to be considered at the assembly. It could not well meet till twelve months hence. All the Christian powers must

¹ See Reimann, *Unterhandlungen*, p. 591.

be invited to attend, and the Pope himself ought to attend personally. Then, again, the place of meeting should not be Trent, but either Cologne, Constance, or Ratisbon, and this Council should be regarded as an entirely new assembly of the Church, not as a continuation of former ones, seeing that the Protestants would undoubtedly demand a hearing with regard to the articles already formulated. He could not coerce the Protestant Estates into submission without running the risk of a disastrous civil war. They had complained that before, at the Council, they had not been furnished with a full safe-conduct made out in the same form as those granted to the Bohemians by the Basle Fathers, and also that they had not been allowed an adequate hearing : in both these points, the Emperor said, he wished them now to be fully satisfied. He also begged the Pope to concede the lay chalice and the marriage of the clergy, at any rate until the Council should have pronounced its decision.¹ The Emperor agreed with Albert of Bavaria that a Diet ought first to be held ; but he should not dare, he said, to mention the Council explicitly in summoning the Diet, because it would prevent the princes attending.²

‘There is no doubt whatever,’ Cardinal Otto wrote to Albert on July 13, respecting the imperial memorandum, ‘that his Majesty’s intentions are good and sincere, but it is pitiful to see that in these religious questions his Majesty trusts more in human cleverness than in Divine Providence, and hopes to attain so much by delay and connivance, whereas the exact opposite must inevitably be the result of such a course.’ ‘God in heaven have mercy on our beloved Fatherland !

¹ Sickel, pp. 55–69.

² Reimann, *Unterhandlungen*, p. 596.

Evil has gained such dominion over us that we no longer know the time and place of our salvation.' The Confessionists, he said, were opposed to the Council because they knew that it would bring their false doctrines to the light of day ; ' but for all that we must not lose heart and say, " The Council will never come to pass ; the Confessionists will not suffer it ; they will set themselves fiercely against it ; they will go to war ; they will impose their will on the Council and take possession of our land and people and ' knock the bottom out of the barrel.' " It would never do for " the lay and clerical rulers, from fear of groundless wanton insurrection, to fold their hands before them and let the teachers of false doctrine do just as they pleased." ' Oh, if only we all of us at Rome, at Vienna, and elsewhere, did but consider what an account we shall have to render to God for all our dilatoriness and inexcusable negligence, and cowardly dependence ! If people say : " No Council can help us any more, the evil has gone on too long," I answer, it is never too late, if we set to work in a spirit of godly hopefulness, true faith, and ardent love. In all such desperate emergencies as the present one, the Catholic Church has always had recourse to the one remedy of a General Council, against which the devil, the sects, the heretics and schismatics have invariably opposed their cleverest wiles, their utmost strength and wickedness, but have always been mightily overcome by Catholic truth.' ' If we go on listening to the opponents they will never to all eternity come to an agreement with us Catholics as to the time, locality, and nature of the Council. But are we for this reason to stand still, and for their sakes endanger the whole of Christendom ? ' ' Ways and means can most certainly be found for

encountering the seditious plottings of the opposite party. For God's sake, therefore, I implore your Grace to talk his Imperial Majesty out of his fears and dilatoriness.'¹

The Emperor, however, could not be moved from his nervous apprehensions, and all the ecclesiastical and temporal princes who still clung to the Church trembled with him. On October 18, Ferdinand wrote to his ambassador at Rome that he could not guarantee that the Estates adhering to the Augsburg Confession would relax any of the hard conditions they had laid down with respect to a Council at the Augsburg Diet of 1559, or that they would attend the Council, even should the Pope announce it as an entirely new one. But if his Holiness persisted in his idea of making the Council a continuation of the former one held at Trent, the Protestant Estates would most certainly resort to arms and stir up insurrection, for they were of opinion that they had not been accorded an adequate hearing, or been fairly judged at the Trent Council; and if they did have recourse to force they would move heaven and earth against the Catholics, and there was little doubt that they would enlist the help of several powerful princes.²

While the Catholic party were thus wholly a prey to terror and pusillanimity, the Protestants were spreading reports of 'dangerous popish plots against the Evangelical Estates.' Information was sent to Duke Albert of Bavaria, according to which the Emperor and the other Catholic potentates intended to root out and destroy the adherents of the Augsburg Confession.³

¹ Bader, pp. 184-189. ² Sickel, pp. 109-110.

³ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 129, note.

The Elector Palatine Frederic was able to inform John Frederic of Saxony by letter that ‘The adversaries will not embark on an extensive campaign, but they intend at once to make themselves masters of six important passes in Germany, and from these points they will carry out their treacherous plans—that is if meanwhile the Council should take place, and shortly after its decrees be enforced.’¹

In proof of the ‘continually increasing oppression of the Papists,’ Duke Christopher of Würtemberg sent the Elector Augustus of Saxony a copy of a letter from King Maximilian of Bohemia, in which the latter complained that his father, the Emperor, would not allow him any longer to retain his evangelical Court preacher, Sebastian Pfauser.² The Protestants were confident of their power. Duke Christopher had before this calculated that, in the event of a fight taking place with the Catholic Estates, they could in a short space of time raise an army of 50,000 infantry and 10,000 cavalry and maintain them indefinitely without any special inconvenience; in fact, he had said, if each Protestant prince dealt singly with his own ‘pfaffen’ so as to prevent their massing together, they would all very quickly be sent to the right about.³ Strenuous efforts were made in the year 1560 to form a Protestant confederacy against ‘the popish Estates. The Prince Electors Joachim II. of Brandenburg and Augustus of Saxony, however, would not consent to join it. Augustus declared that, however secretly such a league was managed, it could not be kept concealed from the

¹ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 120.

² Calinich, *Fürstentag*, p. 63.

³ Despatch to the Elector Palatine, Otto Heinrich, June 7, 1557. Kugler, ii. 180.

Emperor and the other Estates of the realm, and it was much to be feared that Ferdinand, the Catholic Estates, and the foreign potentates would be prompted by it to form counter leagues and other plots. Experience, he said, had taught them the danger of confederacies and their tendency to promote disturbance and war, even when they were formed under the plausible pretext of defence.¹ The alarm concerning the military preparations of the Emperor and the popish party was raised by seditious agitators, who would be only too glad to stir up insurrection in the Empire for their own purposes.¹

It was most deplorable, Cardinal Otto wrote to Albert of Bavaria on July 20, that the Confessionists should be spreading about the report that ‘war was being plotted against them.’ They were ‘embittered to such a degree’ that neither by means of a Council nor by imperial action could they ‘be moved to reasonableness.’ ‘But if, not content with carrying on their policy of slander, insult, turbulence, and sedition in Germany, they pursue it ceaselessly in other countries also, there is no knowing what other powers may be roused to take arms in self-defence. Who can place any confidence in these people while they persistently and unblushingly diffuse so much untruth in all directions with a view to embittering the populace? They will not desist till they have succeeded in crushing out all the remainder of the Catholics. It grieves me greatly to see both spiritual and temporal rulers still looking on passively, as they have done so long, daily procrastinating and throwing away opportunities, to the ineffable damage of all Christendom. I can only

¹ Calinich, *Fürstentag*, pp. 27, 28, 30.

commend the matter to the mercy of God, who, I trust, in His own good time, will graciously bring us all back to a state of peace and tranquillity. But it is essential that the Catholics should, sooner or later, come to a better understanding among themselves, and seriously consider some plan of united defence.'¹

The Cardinal was thrown into great perplexity and agitation by a letter received at Rome from a preacher speaking in the following terms of the forthcoming Council : ‘ We tell you plainly that we mean to have nothing more to do with the Roman Antichrist and his accursed following and diabolical crew. The whole accursed lot are for all eternity damned and kicked out, even though they go on day and night prating of Church and Council. We stand firmly by the words which the holy teacher Martinus Lutherus said and wrote : “ The Pope-ass has crushed us with foul, dirty, stinking burdens ; has made the Church his private closet, and demanded divine honours for what issues from his body. As little as we should dream of worshipping the devil as our Lord and God, so little can we tolerate his apostle, the Pope, or the Antichrist, in his present position of head or lord. For his government consists in nothing but lies and murder, in everlasting corruption of souls and bodies. At this Council you talk about, we should be standing before the devil himself, in the person of the Pope, who has no thought of listening to anything that we have to say, but is bent only on damning and murdering us and driving us to idolatry. Therefore we dare not, we must not, kiss his feet or say : You are my gracious Lord ; but as in Zacharias the angel

¹ Bader, pp. 190-191.

said to the devil : May God punish thee, Satan ! ” Thus wrote Lutherus.¹

As the Protestant Estates had repeatedly declared on former occasions, and again at the Diet of Augsburg in 1559, that they would not recognise any sort of Church assembly summoned by the Pope, it was a matter of indifference to them whether the Council was announced as a continuation of the former one, or as an entirely new departure. In October 1560 the Pope assured the Emperor, through the nuncio Zacharias Delfino, Bishop of Lesina, that the safe-conduct for the Protestants should be made out with every possible provision for security that they themselves could wish ; that they should be allowed to bring forward all their arguments and their grievances at the Council, and should be granted a full and satisfactory hearing ; and that he himself, so far as his conscience allowed, would show them all possible grace and favour, and prove to them that, in very truth, he only wished for their salvation. The Council, he said, was to have complete power to pronounce decision on the claims of the Protestants, on the reform of the clergy, and on the Emperor’s request for the concession of the lay chalice and the marriage of the clergy.²

After long consultation with the nuncio, the Emperor declared himself willing that the Council should assemble at the earliest possible date, and at whatever place the Pope should think best. He only stipulated that it should not be stated in distinct words that this Council

¹ *Von den neuen Hurenblasen des vermeinten Concils zu Trient* (1560), A²⁻³. The passages from Luther are in his *Collected Works*, xxv. 125, 347-348.

² *Instruction für Delfino* in Pogiani, epist. ii. 132-135, note. See Le Plat, iv. 633.

was to be a continuation of the first, and that the invitations to the Protestants should be sent by special nuncios, who were to be backed up by imperial ambassadors.¹

These wishes of the Emperor were acceded to by Pius IV.

On November 16, 1560, Cardinal Otto informed Duke Albert of Bavaria that the Pope had finally decided, the day before, in consistory, to convene the Council of Trent, and that he had declared his intention of being as Christian, peaceable, and conciliatory in his procedure as was possible. ‘Above all,’ he said, ‘he would treat the Confessionists in so true-hearted, benevolent, and paternal a manner, that they would have no cause of complaint, either before God or the world, respecting the hearing and attention they had received, or the judgment pronounced.’ All necessary preliminary matters, he added, should be settled with them through a nuncio, in a friendly spirit. ‘Would to God,’ the Cardinal said to Duke Albert, ‘your Grace could himself see and hear how honourable, sincere, and upright, how entirely free from deceit or hypocrisy, his Holiness’s intentions are. If the Confessionists would attend the Council in person, and could divest themselves of the mistrust and bitterness so deeply rooted in their hearts, they could, I am certain, be pleased and satisfied. They have no need to fear war-like measures from us, for we have not the slightest intention of anything of the sort.’ ‘But if, in spite of all our advances, and in spite of being promised an adequate safe-conduct, the Confessionists still persist in

¹ Reimann, *Unterhandlungen*, pp. 608–610; Voss, *Verhandlungen*, pp. 115 f.; Turba, *Venet. Depeschen*, iii. 161.

their obdurately hostile behaviour, and resort to force in order to prevent the meeting of the Council and the execution of its decrees, and attempt to harass the Catholics by turbulent and seditious proceedings, they will plunge themselves and the whole of Germany into the most terrible danger. For foreign nations would not look on in silence at an attempt on their part to oppress the clergy, and the Muscovites and Turks would not be slow to profit by the opportunity which civil strife in Germany would afford them for making war on Catholics and Confessionists alike.' 'This is what I greatly fear, and what, if God does not interpose, must inevitably happen. We have had, alas! more than one example of the invariable consequences of such lamentable decay of religion, and so much schism in a nation.' 'If the Confessionists, as they pretend, really wish for peace, it is for them now to act in a friendly and conciliatory manner, to trust in God and righteousness, and to put forward their case in a spirit of Christian love ; not to carry on their transactions with rancour and animosity. They will meet with no injustice or foul play from us. But if they insist on continuing their storming and raging, let them take care that the tables are not turned upon them. The Catholics will get more help, both within and without the Empire, both from God and man, than some people think. Moreover, other nations will not quietly await defeat in their own lands, but will far rather flock to the help of the Catholics, than sit still and let their own countries be invaded. Peace is the best policy for both parties, and a far better way of coming to an equitable understanding than sedition and violence.'¹

¹ Bader, pp. 222-223.

By a papal bull of November 29, the Council was summoned to meet at Trent on Easter day the following year. It was not explicitly stated that the Council would be a continuation of the former one, but the decrees suspending the former one were all repealed.¹

On December 21, Cardinal Otto, in another letter to the Duke, again expressed his hope that God would bless the Pope's good, upright, sincere and fatherly intentions respecting this Council, to a satisfactory and decisive issue. 'He added that, in sending his nuncio to the Confessionists, Pius IV. had wished to prove to them, and to the whole world, that his heart was full of love and charity, and to convince them that the object of this Council was to do away with all internal discord, hatred, and ill-feeling, to give each party an opportunity for listening calmly to the pleading and statements of their opponents, so that a mutual understanding might be arrived at, and, by the merciful dispensation of the Almighty, peace at length be concluded, all the clouds obscuring Divine truth be dissipated, and the litigious questions settled to everybody's satisfaction.'²

The Pope had sent the nuncio Delfino to Upper Germany, and the nuncio Commendone, Bishop of Zante, to Lower Germany, to invite the bishops and princes to the Council. By desire of the Emperor they, and the imperial ambassadors who accompanied them, went first to Naumburg, where a brilliant concourse of princes was at the time gathered together to confer about matters of religion.

¹ Voss, *Verhandlungen*, pp. 126, f. 130, 135.

² Bader, pp. 223-234.

CHAPTER XI

RELIGIOUS DISPUTES AT THE NAUMBURG CONVENTION OF PRINCES—THE PROTESTANTS INVITED TO ATTEND THE COUNCIL IN 1561

LENGTHY preliminary negotiations had gone on between the Protestant Estates concerning the holding of this Convention of Princes, which some of them, notably the Elector Palatine Frederic III. and Duke Christopher of Würtemberg, thought urgently necessary in order to compose ‘the religious differences and controversies which had grown to such alarming dimensions,’ and also for the purpose of forming a great Protestant League.

The Elector Augustus of Saxony had at the first shown exceedingly little desire for a convention. He had no intention of joining a political league against ‘the popish Estates,’¹ and any further attempt at ‘reconciliation in matters of religion’ seemed to him uncalled for, as he had already issued orders that all superintendents, preachers, and teachers were to abide by the Frankfort Recess, and to be guided by it to the letter in all disputed points of doctrine.² Elector Joachim II. of Brandenburg was of the same opinion as Augustus of Saxony. He said that, ‘under existing circumstances, an assembly of this sort would produce more acrimony and division than unity, not only among the theologians, but also among the Estates adhering to

¹ See above, p. 206.

² Calinich, *Fürstentag*, pp. 27 f.

the Confession of Augsburg.¹ The Landgrave Philip of Hesse, on the other hand, thought that an understanding between the theologians might be arrived at if the princes were personally present at the Convention, and, as Holy Scripture warranted them in doing, ‘interposed their authority.’ The theologians, he said, must not be allowed ‘to dispute at great length;’ they must be made to agree about the Augsburg Confession, which would be laid before them, and must be seriously admonished by the princes to abstain from libellous writing and from overmuch printing. The Landgrave urged again and again on the delegates of the Saxon Elector that the theologians ‘must not be allowed to dispute about recondite articles, but asked to give a plain exposition of doctrine.’

It was desirable also ‘to take into consideration the best means for offering a united opposition to, and preventing the meeting of, the threatened papal Council.’²

Thus we see that the Landgrave considered it part of the business of the Convention to prevent the meeting of the Council.

At the end of June 1560 the Elector Palatine Frederic, Christopher of Würtemberg, and Duke John Frederic of Saxony met together at Hilsbach, and agreed to do all they could to prevail on the Protestant Estates to join unanimously in subscribing afresh to the Augsburg Confession, ‘with an appropriate introduction and conclusion,’ and thus bring the disputes to an end.³ In order to win over the Landgrave Philip to this plan, Duke John Frederic and the Elector Palatine Wolfgang

¹ Calinich, *Fürstentag*, p. 63.

² *Ibid.* pp. 33–34, 37.

³ Kugler, ii. 190–193. See also Heidenhain, *Unionspolitik Philipps von Hessen*, pp. 187 f.

of Zweibrücken went in July to Marburg. Whereas, however, the Landgrave had proposed to the Electors of Saxony to make the Augsburg Confession the basis of reconciliation, these two princes now discovered that Philip ‘did not appear any longer to believe much in the Confession himself.’ According to Wolfgang’s account, Philip was now a champion of ‘Zwinglian heresy, which he defended freely and openly at table and on other occasions, in the most shameless manner before the whole world, and in such audacious language that it made one’s hair stand up on end.’ Besides which he had said, in the presence of John Frederic, that ‘the Weimar theologians were all of them, save your respect, scoundrels and villains, and John Frederic had been not a little scandalised.’¹ Nevertheless, Philip came forward again in August to sign the Augsburg Confession.² Augustus of Saxony was also in the end won over to the Convention by the assurance that ‘there would be no disputations or condemnations at it, and that no prince would bring against another the charge that his theologians had falsified the pure doctrine, or fallen away from it.’³

The Convention was to meet at Naumburg. ‘Possibly, at this assembly at Naumburg,’ Camerarius wrote to Duke Albert of Prussia in January 1561, ‘the princes may be able to oppose an effectual dam to the insolent, unbridled proceedings of the theologians. If God Almighty does not interpose to stop all this insubordination and schism, I fear that terrible disturbance and anarchy will shortly ensue.’⁴

The Convention was opened on January 21, 1561.⁵

¹ Kugler, ii. 196–197.

² *Ibid.* ii. 198.

³ Calinich, *Fürstentag*, pp. 82–83.

⁴ Voight, *Briefwechsel*, p. 133.

⁵ For the Naumburg Convention, or Diet of Princes, see now the

The princes present in person were the Electors Frederic of the Palatinate, and Augustus of Saxony, the Dukes Frederic of Saxony, Christopher of Würtemberg, and Ulrich of Mecklenburg ; the Landgrave Philip of Hesse and the Margrave Charles of Baden. The Elector Joachim II. of Brandenburg, the Margrave Hans of Cüstrin and Duke Barnim of Pomerania, and other princes had sent delegates. Several counts and lords also attended the meeting in person.

Christopher of Würtemberg cherished the hope that the reconciliation in matters of religion would be followed by the conclusion of a political league among the Estates, and by a ‘Christian agreement’ respecting the Council, with Denmark, Sweden, England, and Scotland.¹ This prince considered it of special importance that a ‘universal code’ (*Corpus*) of Christian doctrine’ should be formulated. ‘Such a code,’ he said, ‘could be neither the Bible, as so much misunderstanding of all sorts had arisen with regard to the meaning of Holy Writ, nor the Augsburg Confession, as this creed was “essentially opposed to the Papacy,” and had also given rise to a great deal of misunderstanding.’ It would not be enough even if the Confession should be unanimously signed by everybody : a code such as he advocated was especially necessary, he said, on account of the article on the Communion.²

But ‘unanimous agreement’ was scarcely to be detailed account by Heidenhain, *Unionspolitik Philippis von Hessen*, pp. 203–274.

¹ Kugler, ii. 217–218, note. The Landgrave Philip of Hesse also endeavoured at Naumburg, and again at the beginning of the year 1562, to arrange a Protestant League which should connect itself with France and England. See Ritter, i. 229, and Heidenhain, *Unionspolitik Philippis von Hessen*, pp. 273 f., 294 ff.

² Kugler, ii. 218–219, note.

hoped for at Naumburg, seeing that dissension and quarrelling arose during the very first session. The Elector Augustus began with a severe denunciation of his cousin Duke John Frederic for having omitted, in his writ of summons, the stipulation that 'all condemnation of religious abuses and of sects was to be avoided.' Bitterer still grew the wrangling among the princes when it came to the principal business of the assembly, viz. the signing of the Confession. All the different parties at strife, who had been fiercely condemning each other from the outset, had all taken their stand on the Augsburg Confession, and each had accused the other of being unfaithful to its teaching. Reconciliation in this matter was all the more impossible from the fact that the different versions of the Confession made it easy for the holders of different opinions to justify their views by different texts.¹ When the question was put, 'which edition or which copy of the Creed was to be signed, it was found that the Estates no longer possessed the original text of the Confession of 1530, and that they would be reduced to choosing between Melanchthon's versions of 1530, 1531, and 1540. However, even the oldest of these, those of 1530 and 1531, one in quarto and the other in octavo, did not correspond. It appeared that the Latin text of the quarto edition contained popish doctrine concerning the Eucharist, viz. a formal acknowledgment of the doctrine of transubstantiation ;² in the octavo edition, on the other hand, the words respecting the transformation of the bread had been left out. The Elector Frederic of

¹ See above, pp. 36-38.

² In this edition there was not only mention of a *corporalis præsentia*, but also such expressions as the following : 'mutato pane, panem vere in carnem mutari.' See Calinich, *Fürstentag*, p. 166.

Saxony, who was inclined to Calvinism, would on no conditions sign the quarto edition, nor would the other princes expose themselves to the reproach of having “ ranged themselves on the side of popery ” in such an important matter. Frederic declared emphatically that at Naumburg they had not stuck to the Confession which had been presented to the Emperor at Augsburg in 1530 ; for in that version, he said, the article respecting the Sacrament was worded in such a manner that the Electors and princes sitting at Naumburg with him could not have subscribed to it with a good conscience, and without seeming, in the matter of the Communion, to be courting the Pope and his legate.’ For in the Confession, as it was sent up to the Emperor, the words ‘ under the species of bread and wine ’ were alone used, whereas, in the apology annexed to it, there was the phrase ‘ after the transformation of the bread ’ . . . ‘ in such a way that the then reigning Emperor and all the papists had approved of this said article as it stood in the apology, and had not opposed it.’¹

To the Emperor Ferdinand, on the other hand, the princes said in a preface to the copy of the Confession signed by them : ‘ They had been falsely accused of no longer being united, and of having apostatised from the Confession which they had drawn up in 1530. In refutation of these calumnies they had now met together to show that they meant to stand loyally by this Confession.’²

The position taken up by the Elector Augustus of Saxony was a particularly odd one.

During the transactions which preceded the Conven-

¹ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 156–157. See Calinich, *Fürstentag*, p. 166.

² Calinich, p. 167.

tion of Princes, Augustus, in answer to Duke John Frederic's remark that at Naumburg they must sign that copy of the Confession which was presented to the Emperor by the Chancellor Brück in 1530, had assured John Frederic in an autograph letter that he knew of no other copy, and that the one of 1530 must certainly be the one signed because 'all former truces as well as the present Religious Peace were based upon it.'¹ At Naumburg, however, in the very first session, the Elector proposed that the edition of 1540 should be selected for signature, although this one differed in very essential points from the original one.² He should be all the more glad, he said, for this to be done, because this edition of 1540 was the one always referred to by the visiting inspectors in the parishes of his electorate.³ The Elector Palatine Frederic was also of opinion that as they were obliged to withdraw their adhesion to the original text of the oldest editions on account of the doctrine of transubstantiation, the best course would be to subscribe to the edition of 1540, which was now used almost universally in all schools and churches. It was decided, however, by a majority of votes that the Confession of 1531 should be signed, and Augustus then moved that it should at least be stated in a preface that the later editions of the Confession were approved of. The Elector Frederic, in supporting this resolution, proposed the further amendment that the Frankfort Recess should also be recognised, side by side with the altered versions of the Confession, as an authoritative rule of faith. This was opposed by the Dukes John Frederic of Saxony and Ulrich of Mecklenburg, who

¹ On Sept. 11, 1560. Calinich, pp. 83-84.

² See above, pp. 36-38.

³ Calinich, *Fürstentag*, p. 139.

moved on their part, albeit ineffectually, that the Smalcaldian articles should be signed anew as constituting a good Lutheran confession of faith.

The Electors Augustus and Frederic were entrusted with the preparation of the preface, and on January 30 they submitted a draft for the approval of the assembly. It began with the statement that, ‘in order that the Emperor, and every one else, should see that they had no intention of defending or propagating any new doctrine,’ they would ‘this time’ leave out of account ‘those more adequate and amplified versions, explained and enlarged from the text of the Scriptures,’ which had appeared in 1540 and 1542, and had been sent up to the imperial president and the collocutors at the Colloquy of Worms. The fact that the various editions differed in essential points was not mentioned in this preface, which gave its sanction to the latest versions also. The preface went on to state that it was not the intention of the princes ‘to repudiate the Confession as handed in and interpreted in the year 1540, or to let themselves be persuaded against it,’ all the less so as this edition was in use in most of the schools and churches.

The Dukes of Saxony and Meeklenburg, however, by no means approved of this preface. They would not give their assent to the altered Creed, which served as a cloak for the Calvinists. ‘In opposition to avowed truth,’ they said, the preface denied the existence of religious schism among the Estates. Such ignoring and concealment of facts did not improve the position of the Augsburg Confessionists, for the papists were fully aware of all the divisions that existed among them.¹

¹ Calinich, *Fürstentag*, pp. 78–82.

John Frederic insisted that all the different forms of corruption and sectarian error that had crept into the Lutheran Church must be specified and condemned ; and he drew special attention to the heretical opinions of his father-in-law, the Elector Palatine. His speech led to ‘unedifying scenes’ among the princes. His Court preacher, Aurifaber, recounts that ‘the princes in council, especially the Landgrave of Hesse and the Elector of Saxony, treated Duke John Frederic most rudely, snorting at him and holding out all manner of insulting threats against him.’¹ The Elector Frederic said that his son-in-law, not content with schism in Church and school, had sought to alienate from him (the Elector) the officials of his court and chancellery, and even his own wife.² John Frederic suddenly left Naumburg on February 3, without taking leave of his brother princes.

After the Duke’s departure another ‘quite unexpected incident’ followed. The Elector Palatine had succeeded in bringing the rest of the princes to accept the Melanchthonian doctrine of the Sacrament, couched as it was in the ‘preface’ in the words of the Frankfort Recess. But John Frederic, after leaving Naumburg, drafted and sent up a ‘preface’ of his own, in which the sacramental doctrine was stated in the words of the Smalcaldian articles, and most of the princes, in order to gain over the Duke, then declared themselves willing, ‘in the matter of the Sacrament, to abide by his meaning and interpretation.’ They said that they ‘would state in a common letter their opinions on this and other matters, and they hoped that, as the Naumburg preface could not now be altered again, the Duke would

¹ *Ibid.* p. 185, note.

² Kluckhohn, *Friedrich der Fromme*, p. 94.

be satisfied with such a declaration and would add his own name to complete the list of signatures.'

This declaration, be it noted, was not to be a mere explanation of the text, but was to contain matter foreign to it.

But neither the Elector Palatine nor John Frederic, the only two princes who really knew what they wanted, would consent to such a 'Declaration.' The Elector declared that such a proceeding could only result in the lowering of princely feelings and needless quarrels of restless theologians. John Frederic said he could not budge from the exact letter of his own preface. It was not he only, he added, who had scruples as to signing 'the obscure, halting, doubting, and involved preface drawn up by the Electors Augustus and Frederic ;'¹ the Duke of Mecklenburg and the leading towns of Saxony were of the same mind. The Elector Joachim II. of Brandenburg said bluntly that the Elector Palatine Frederic must subscribe to the Smalcaldian doctrine of the Sacrament, or else they must all break with him and leave him to his fate.²

In the principal business of the assembly, viz. the adjustment of religious dissensions, the princes had utterly failed ; the divisions stood out still more sharply and distinctly than before. Neither had they realised the hope, cherished by many of them at the commencement of the meeting, and expressed also by Queen Elizabeth of England through a special envoy, that the Estates should strengthen their position for mutual help by the formation of a political league.³

¹ Calinich, *Fürstentag*, pp. 311-315, 333.

² *Ibid.* pp. 386-387.

³ Heppe, *Geschichte des deutschen Protestantismus*, 1. Beil. pp. 132-135.

It was obviously impossible that the religious schism should be either healed or diminished when, in the preface which had been adopted, both the earlier and the later versions of the Confession were recognised as equally authoritative ; nor could it avail anything that the Estates decreed in the ‘ Recess ’ of the meeting a censorship intended to subject all spiritual activity to the authority of this declaration. Neither privately nor publicly—so ran the clause—was any book to be printed in the dominions of the princes without having first been submitted to the censors of the press (who were to be appointed in all directions), and by them pronounced to be ‘ not only in substance, but also in form, entirely in harmony with the Augsburg Confession.’ Least of all were scurrilous pamphlets affecting the tranquillity of the Church to be tolerated.

Nevertheless, ‘ dissensions in the Church and the practice of reviling and fulminating from the pulpits grew worse than ever after 1561.’ ‘ Alas, alas,’ wrote the Protestant Frederic Seiler, ‘ how grievously are the tongues of the Protestants divided against each other ; they are like unto the builders of the tower of Babel ; how they blare through the trumpet of Seba ! ’¹

While the princes at Naumburg were in the thick of their fight over their confession of faith, the papal nuncios, Delfino and Commendone, and the imperial ambassadors arrived on the scene on January 28, 1561, to invite them all to the Council at Trent. It appears that, previous to the opening of this convention, Christopher of Würtemberg at any rate had no intention of refusing an invitation to the Council. During the

¹ Calinich, *Fürstentag*, pp. 386-387.

second stage of the Trent Synod of 1552, he had sent in a formulary of faith drawn up by John Brenz, and had announced the advent of theologians to speak on its behalf ; shortly afterwards the assembly had been broken up by the Elector Maurice of Saxony. When in 1560 the question of a Council was again mooted, he had said to the Elector Palatine Frederic and Duke John Frederic, at the assembly at Hilsbach : ‘ I do not see how we Augsburg Confessionists can present a united front and act like one man at the Council, when we are divided into so many parties. Ever since 1530 we have indeed clamoured for a free Christian Council, at which we might defend our faith and our Confession by appeal to the Holy Scriptures ; but the whole thing would be an ignominious failure if the magisterial bodies among us should refuse to alter their opinions.’¹

The Naumburg Convention had been expected to unite all these different parties, but, as the meeting had not fulfilled its object, it was now considered unlikely that the Council would be attended by the Protestant princes.

‘ The nuncios,’ one of the imperial ambassadors wrote to Ferdinand, ‘ have met with a strange welcome here ; they are treated with scant respect, and are hissed at by the populace.’²

On January 31 the ambassadors delivered the imperial message to the assembled princes. It was as follows : ‘ The continuous schisms in religion, with the mutual mistrust they engendered, had caused the greatest injury to the Empire ; the Turks had grown more overbearing and aggressive than ever, and were again threatening to overrun Christendom both by

¹ Kugler, ii. 190–193.

² Bucholtz, viii. 392, note.

land and by water ; Livonia was being cruelly harassed by the Muscovites, whose savageness spread terror in the adjacent lands also ; if the princes did not combine together more heartily than they had done hitherto, all their foreign neighbours would proceed to wrest from the Empire whatever territories they had a fancy for. Within the Empire peace, justice, and order had utterly collapsed, all godly fear and Christian discipline were going to the ground, and the common people had for the most part fallen into such a lawless, ungodly, bestial mode of life, that even infidels could not be worse. Moreover, it was a known fact that the number of heretical sects was increasing from day to day ; some of these denied the divinity, some the humanity, of Christ ; others refused to believe in the Trinity, rejected the Gospel, and were endeavouring to introduce a sort of Turkish or Jewish creed. For the removal of these schisms, and for effecting a salutary reform of the abuses which had crept in among all the Estates, a Council was the most effective and proper means. Hence the Emperor had spared no trouble to bring about the meeting of such an assembly, and to arrange that it should be attended by representatives from all quarters. The bishopric and the town of Trent were loyal to the Emperor, and also allied to him, and the safety of this town and diocese was under imperial control. The Estates could count on being provided with perfectly adequate safe-conducts ; the proceedings at the Council, as the Pope had assured the Emperor, would be of the most friendly and temperate nature. The Emperor would hold faithfully by the terms of the Religious Peace, and he was at a loss to see from what quarter it could be threatened if he as head. they as members,

adhered firmly to it. And whereas he on his part was fully minded to extend to them and theirs every fatherly care and support, he trusted that they in return would use this opportunity for the welfare and good of the Empire.¹

To this message of the Emperor the princes answered the ambassadors that the Council, as announced by the Pope, did not correspond to the conditions formerly laid down by them,² and was not calculated to diminish the schisms in religious doctrine nor to redress existing abuses.

The nuncios, who had with difficulty obtained audience, handed the Pope's breves to each separate prince, and also the bulls of Convocation. Delfino assured them that the Council would not only grant them a hearing on all points, but would also concede every reasonable demand. He urged on them the importance of doing what they could to restore the unity of the faith, seeing that there were now as many different opinions in religion as there were individuals to hold them, as many gospels as there were teachers; he assured them that their safe-conducts would be of the surest nature, and begged them to send their delegates to the Council. Commendone pointed out that now was the very opportune moment for a Council; for peace had been concluded between France and Spain, and the present Pope was ardently bent on the abolition of all ecclesiastical abuses, and on the restoration of decayed Church discipline. He admonished them to remember that religion and salvation were at stake, and that, if the foundations of faith were destroyed, empires also would crumble to pieces.³

¹ Calinich, *Fürstentag*, pp. 190-192.

² See above, p. 123.

³ Raynald ad a. 1561, Nos. 25, 26. See Reimann, *Sendung des Nuntios Commendone*, pp. 244-245.

Scarcely had the nuncios returned to their inns, when the princes sent them back the papal briefs unopened, and this for the simple reason that the Pope, in the outside address, had styled them ‘beloved sons,’ while they did not regard him as their spiritual father.¹ Their answer to the bull of Convocation was as follows: ‘The Pope had no right to proclaim a Council, and to set himself up as arbiter of religious disputes, when it was he himself who was the author of all the existing errors, and who, more than anybody else, cruelly suppressed the truth. The principal occupation of the Popes was to set nation against nation, and, by weakening the power of other governments, to augment their own authority. They were gruesome oppressors of all people who would not humble themselves to the extent of worshipping their persons and the idols they set up, but who desired to live in true piety.’

The princes were all at strife together as to which was the genuine Augsburg Confession; but as to the Emperor, so to the nuncios, they denied the existence of schism among them. It was unjust, they declared, to accuse them of want of unity of faith, their unity being abundantly testified not only by their distinct confession of faith sent in to the Emperor at Augsburg in 1530, but also by divers other writings which had explained and disseminated the truth of divine teaching. The Roman Church, on the other hand, was so permeated and laden with errors and abominable abuses,

¹ On March 11, 1561—so Count Günther of Schwarzburg wrote to Prince William of Orange—the princes ‘informed the papal envoys that they did not understand how they could be the Pope’s sons, but they hoped their mothers had been virtuous and that they had other fathers’ (Groen van Prinsterer, i. 51). This answer, however, if at all, was not sent officially. See Reimann, *Sendung*, pp. 279–280.

while at the same time it so outrageously suppressed the teaching of the Gospel, that it was more like a system of pagan idolatry than a Christian institution. In obedience to the stringent command of God to flee from idolatry, the princes and electors had been driven into separating themselves from the Roman Church, and they were by no means willing to submit to being dictated to by the Pope. The Roman Emperor Ferdinand, their one and only liege lord, had the sole right to summon a Council.¹

Commendone replied in a calm and dignified manner that the Pope had announced the Council in the orthodox form and manner observed in all ages by the Church ; and the Emperor, to whom the princes were pleased to confine the right of summoning it, was too clear-sighted not to recognise the difference between spiritual and temporal rights. From the moment of his accession to the papal throne, the Pope had turned his attention to reform, and his Holiness had all the greater pleasure in summoning the Council, as he looked upon it as the best means of carrying out this end. To assert that discord and uncertainty of opinion reigned among the new religionists was no unjust accusation ; the fact was patent to all the world. The very writings which the princes had referred to confirmed this charge, for they were full of novel and self-contradicting opinions of their different theologians. ‘ How could the princes pretend to unity and fixity of faith when the novelty of their doctrines, their deviations from the orthodox belief, their separation from the established authority of the Church, stamped them, at any rate, with dubious-

¹ Raynald ad a. 1561, No. 27. See Calinich, *Fürstentag*, pp. 204-206; Reimann, *Sendung*, pp. 245-246.

ness and indecision ? They must remember that the question at stake was no less a one than that of eternal salvation or eternal damnation. Although St. Paul, the chosen vessel of the Lord, according to his own assertion, had received the Gospel not from men, but by revelation, he was nevertheless commanded by revelation to go to Jerusalem and to compare his Gospel with that of the Apostles, in order that he might not run, or have run, in vain.' 'Commendone bade the princes remember that from the time of the Apostles downwards all the ancient fathers had always turned to the Roman Church as the one teacher and guide to truth.' From Rome, too, the Germans, as their Highnesses must know, had first received Christianity. The princes should consider those words of the Gospel : ' How often would I have gathered my children together, as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, but ye would not ! ' ¹

The princes gave the nuncios no answer to the message delivered by them, but they recorded in the 'Recess' of the Naumburg Convention their firm intention that a meeting of theologians and councillors should be convened at Erfurt to hold further deliberations respecting the Council. Their principal aim was to prevent the German bishops from attending the Council. Commendone had learnt at Vienna that the bishops, whose vassals were for the most part infected with heresy, would keep away from Trent out of fear that the Protestant Estates might persist in their obstinacy. At Naumburg the councillors and secretaries of the princes declared repeatedly to the nuncios

¹ Reimann, *Sendung*, pp. 247-248

that not one of the Protestant princes, nor even a single bishop, would appear at the Council.¹

While the nuncio Delfino proceeded on his business to South Germany, Commendone repaired to the Elector Joachim II. of Brandenburg, who had not come in person to the Naumburg Convention. He met with a friendly welcome at Berlin. Joachim received from him the papal bull and the brief addressed to himself in the presence of his councillors and theologians, praised the admirable character and exceeding kindness of Pius IV., and promised to induce the other Protestant princes to labour for peace. Nevertheless, he said that he could only advance the same opinion as theirs with respect to the Council; in any case the theologians who subscribed to the Augsburg Confession must be allowed the right of voting. On Commendone's asking: 'What, then, is to be said to the other sects, who will also claim this right, if it is conceded to the Confessionists?' the Elector answered: 'It must be refused to all the others; for they are not, like the Confessionists, in possession of the true Word of God.' When Commendone objected: 'But all the sects think they possess it;' adding that God must have placed some infallible judge on the earth, Joachim was silent. The following day he resumed the discussion with the words, 'No sect can legitimately claim the right of voting; for, apart from the fact of their being all of them heretics, they are not in direct opposition to the authority of the Roman Church, as are the adherents of the Augsburg Confession, whose chief aim and endeavour is to remove existing abuses and to restore the purity of Gospel teaching.' But this was the claim advanced by all the sects equally.

¹ Reimann, *Sendung*, pp. 243, 250.

It would be very easy, said the nuncio, for each one of them to make complaints of the Apostolic See, and to set itself in opposition to it, in order to obtain a voice at the Council, or to escape from the judgment of the Pope. At the close of their long conversation Joachim said : ‘ In truth you have given me much to think about.’ He once more promised the nuncio to do his best to persuade the princes to send delegates to the Council, and to choose for the purpose honest, conciliatory men.¹ And he did indeed represent to the princes that it was not advisable for them to reject the Council with such contempt and indignation, and thus give the enemy occasion to say that the Evangelicals either despise their Council or fear its decision.²

Commendone’s and Delfino’s negotiations had so little result that Commendone reported to Rome : ‘ I do not believe that one of the bishops is thinking of coming to Trent. The heretical princes are doing all in their power to keep them from going, in order, as much as possible, to weaken and diminish the authority of the Council.’³

The bishops were full of apprehension lest in their absence ‘ sedition should be stirred up in their territories, or armed invasions take place.’ The Emperor himself told the Pope that it would be extremely dangerous for the bishops to attend the Council unless the Protestants were also prevailed on to come ; he begged the Pope to suggest ways and means by which possible attacks from the Protestant princes might be guarded against.⁴

¹ Reimann, *Sendung*, pp. 251–259.

² Droysen, *Preussische Politik*, 2^b, 287.

³ Reimann, *Sendung*, pp. 260 f.

⁴ Bucholtz, viii. 412.

‘ It is only by firm trust in God,’ wrote the Cardinal-bishop Otto von Augsburg, ‘ that we can hope for any good result from the Council, on which, nevertheless, the salvation of the Church and the Christian faith depend, in this our ill-fated, distracted fatherland. But why should we not pluck up heart, and, as it were, hope against hope, after the pattern of our fathers, who in the darkest, stormiest times, when the ship of Peter threatened inevitably to sink, still preserved undaunted faith in God, and were thus enabled to triumph over the tempest ? ’ ‘ If we put our trust in men, be they kings, princes, or bishops, we are only driven to despair ; for they sway hither and thither, either from indolence, or fear, or anxious apprehension of all sorts of possibilities ; even the most solemn human promises cannot be relied on. Let us trust in God and await the issue. “ Put spurs to your efforts, and trust,” is the Pope’s motto.’¹

That solemn promises could not be trusted is shown by the example of Archbishop Sigmund of Magdeburg. He had presented the nuncio Commendone with a written statement, in which he said he gratefully accepted the benediction of the Pope, and thanked God that He had vouchsafed to endow Pius IV. with such understanding of, and so much good will towards, the German nation, that for their sake he had convened a council. He should certainly come to Trent very soon, and although he knew that there would be many men at the Council much more learned than he was, there would be none who would show greater loyalty and reverence towards his Holiness : he should appeal to the Pope, with the utmost confidence, for help and advice in his

¹ Aug. 27, 1561, to the Jesuit, John of Reidt. See above, p. 40, n. 3.

own ecclesiastical affairs.¹ But at the very time he was making these solemn protestations, he was at heart a Protestant, and before another year had passed he openly avowed himself a subscriber to the Augsburg Confession.

The period was a most critical one.

‘All Catholics believe,’ said the King of Poland’s delegates who had arrived at Trent, ‘that the salvation of the whole Church depends on this Council.’²

¹ Reimann, *Sendung*, pp. 256–257.

² Raynald ad a. 1562, No. 121.

CHAPTER XII

REOPENING OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT IN 1562—WHY
THE SPIRITUAL PRINCES OF THE EMPIRE DID NOT
ATTEND IT—THE LAY CHALICE—THE MARRIAGE OF
THE CLERGY—THE ‘REFORM OF THE PRINCES’

FROM the moment that Pius IV. had decided on convening a General Council, he had directed all his energies towards the realisation of the plan, although at times he had been discouraged by the great difficulties which encountered him at every turn. ‘Our intentions are good,’ he said to the Venetian ambassador, to whom he gave audience one morning in his bedchamber, where he was laid up with gout; ‘our intentions are good, but we stand completely alone.’ ‘It filled me with pity,’ the ambassador writes, ‘to see the Pope lying in bed and to hear him saying: “We stand alone with this great burden.”’ His Holiness has most certainly displayed all the zeal in this matter of the Council that was to be expected from so exemplary a supreme shepherd; he has left nothing undone that could contribute to the success of this most sacred and necessary work.¹

On January 18, 1562, the Council, which had been twice interrupted, resumed its sessions for the third time.

All the Christian sovereigns were invited to it, and all the non-Catholic ones were provided with safe-

¹ Ranke, *Päpste*, i. 328 f.

conducts and were solemnly exhorted by the Council 'to join in the work of unification and reconciliation, that so they might come to apprehend that charity which is the bond of perfection, and that the hallowing peace of Christ might be revealed to their hearts, to which peace they were called in one harmonious body.'¹ The Emperor had wished to defer the decisions on dogmatic points in order to have the chance of further transactions with the Protestants, and the legates, consequently, with the Pope's assent, proposed to the assembly to begin proceedings with the Index of the books that were to be prohibited, because this course would furnish opportunity for renewing the invitation to the Protestants on the pretext that they should speak in defence of the books that were objected to. Nevertheless, the Protestants kept themselves aloof. The Emperor had no better success than the Council in his endeavours to persuade them to come to Trent, notwithstanding the facts that complete political tolerance had been most securely guaranteed to the Augsburg Confessionists by imperial decrees, and that the Protestant Estates themselves were at heart convinced that the Emperor would neither violate the Religious Peace himself nor assent to its violation by others. The Protestants declared the Council to be 'a Synod of Satan.'

Throughout the whole duration of the ecclesiastical assembly reports went about that 'a great popish

¹ See Bucholtz, viii. 419. The Archbishop of Prague wrote to the Emperor on March 10, 1562: 'Salvus conductus talis a concilio datur protestantibus, qualem ante decennium ipsi sibi conscripserunt et in hac forma dari voluerunt, imo sunt qui certo affirment hanc formulam publicæ fidei ab ipso Brentio conscriptam esse.' In Sickel, p. 276; see the Report of the imperial ambassadors, p. 275.

league was plotting the extirpation of the evangelists, who were all to be massacred in the bloodiest manner.' It behoved the Protestants, therefore, 'to be beforehand with their opponents, and to ward off the danger threatened by the Catholics.' 'Poison and the dagger of the assassin' were even to be resorted to by 'the Pope, and by some of his bishops, against the lives of the evangelical princes.'

The Cardinal-bishop Otto von Augsburg, who heard all these reports in Rome, wrote to Duke Albert of Bavaria on September 26, 1562: 'The Confessionists are spreading about the report that they have trustworthy information that the Cardinal of Trent has commissioned certain Italians to assassinate some of the Electors and princes of the Empire, and also that his Holiness the Pope has despatched one Ludovico Martello with poison.' '*Pfui!* it's nothing but a pack of wicked, heretical lies, through which they reveal to us the venom and hatred of their hearts. In olden times, not even an ignorant peasant—how much less, then, a prince—would have believed such palpable falsehoods for a moment. To give credence to such lame lies shows a shallowness of mind which is more French than German.' Before this Otto had written: 'With infinite pain and sorrow I have learnt of an utterly baseless rumour, which is current throughout the whole of Germany, among all classes, high and low, viz. that the Pope contemplates a bloody enforcement of the Council's decrees. For the sake, therefore, of the pure and godly truth, and as a true-born loyal German, I am constrained, out of Christian love and trust in God, to issue this true and simple announcement: The Pope is convinced that this Council is the best means for

doing away with all the different abuses and evils that exist ; neither the Pope nor any of the Catholics are thinking of war, or equipping for it ; the opposite party should not believe the reports of seditious agitators, but should send emissaries to inform themselves of the truth. The rumours, the writings, and the intrigues that are going on make one fear that a knot of sedition-mongers may bring on a wholly unnecessary war. From such a calamity may Christ our Redeemer and Saviour preserve us and our beloved Germany !' It was imperatively necessary, however, the Cardinal urged on Duke Albert, that the Catholic party should, at any rate, ' be prepared for defence in all possible ways ; for otherwise it was to be feared that, if one sword did not keep the other in its sheath, affairs would not be settled without a terrible row.' ' I am distressed and perturbed beyond measure,' he goes on, ' at seeing my dearly-loved fatherland in such danger, trouble, and need, and, apart from God, I see no help for her. But in God's great mercy and wonderful providence I cannot doubt ; He never forsakes those who trust in Him. Your Grace may indeed believe me when I say that Pius IV. is animated by the most sincere and fatherly intentions, and that for full a thousand years there has never been a Pope who has been more easily influenced in all reasonable directions.'¹

The work of preventing the Council, which the Landgrave Philip of Hesse had considered a duty incumbent on the Protestant princes,² had not proved feasible. It

¹ Jan. 24 and Sept. 26, 1562, in the Reichsarchiv at Munich, *Augsburg. Correspondenz*, ii. 14 ff., 27 ff., 194. Kindly contributed by Dr. J. Vochezer. Otto's 'Einfältig trewherzig Bedenken,' in Goldast, pp. 599-601.

² See above, pp. 214, 215.

was all in vain that ‘several princes’ had insisted that the Emperor’s office required of him as a duty that he should ‘oppose with all his might the insufferable continuation of the Council of Trent,’ for all its earlier decisions had been ‘annulled and abolished’ by the Passau Treaty and the Religious Peace. ‘If the Pope and his followers persisted in their intention of holding this Council, or of carrying out any other scheme in opposition to the will of the Emperor, Ferdinand, they urged, would be acting in a fatherly and legitimate manner if he left it in the hands of the Augsburg Confessionists to bring about a speedy and thorough shipwreck of the papal plans.’¹ But their remonstrances had no result. This much, however, was gained by the Protestants, that, in spite of all the Pope’s entreaties and admonitions, not one of the ecclesiastical princes of the Empire dared to show himself at the Council. The three spiritual Electors wrote as follows to the Emperor on March 3, 1562 : ‘If we were to go to Trent in person, in spite of the Council’s being unacceptable to the Estates who subscribe to the Augsburg Confession, mistrust and suspicion might be kindled in the minds of the said Estates, as though by means of this Council we were plotting somewhat against the general peace of the country, which suspicion and mistrust would be all the more strengthened by the false reports disseminated through the Holy Empire by wicked men, to the effect that dangerous plots are hatching against the said Augsburg Confessionists.’² The Archbishop of Mayence said the same as the Archbishops of Treves³

¹ Ferdinand’s despatch to his ambassadors at Rome, dated Oct. 31, 1560, in Sickel, pp. 124–125.

² Sickel, p. 274.

³ See above, p. 187.

and of Salzburg ;¹ if he were to leave his diocese, its ruin might easily follow.² The idea of combining together in loyal union for defence against and triumph over common dangers, and for the sake also of dutifully furthering the crying needs of the Church, by no means entered into the policy of the German ecclesiastical princes of that period. They were princes and lords indeed, but, as a rule, no true ecclesiastics. The temporal power, which had been bestowed on them for the protection and support of their spiritual prestige, served only to weaken the Church. Before the opening of the Council, the Emperor himself had sent word to Rome that the bishops would imperil the safety of their lands if they went to the Council ; but after the sessions had begun at Trent, he yielded to the Pope's request, and sent the bishops repeated exhortations to go and take part in the assembly. On March 30, 1562, he instructed his ambassador at Trent to inform the legates that he considered it most essential that the bishops and prelates should take part in the deliberations on reform ; no good result could otherwise be hoped for for Germany. It was not his fault, he said, that the bishops had not come ; he had done all in his power to prevail on them to put in an appearance : the Pope and the Council must in their turn admonish them of the duty of holy obedience. 'Moreover,' he added, 'whether they attend or not, it is our fixed opinion that the business of reform must be proceeded with, and the duty which is owed to Germany not be neglected on account of their absence.'³ Once more the bishops were summoned to attend, but still they did not come.

¹ See above, pp. 180-182.

² Sickel, p. 287.

³ Sickel, p. 183, note.

‘ How is it that the German bishops so lightly esteem their mitres ? ’ asked the Bishop of Lanciano at a public meeting of one of the imperial envoys : ‘ Did they not take the oath of obedience at their consecration ? and do they not hold all temporal power by right of being bishops ? ’ The ambassador answered that the bishops kept away from fear of the danger threatened from the Protestants.¹

Because the bishops did not take part in the Council the Protestants chose to assert that ‘ the decisions it came to were consequently not binding on the Catholics either.’ For, said they, ‘ it is obvious that a concourse of Italians at Trent does not constitute a General Council to which the papists are bound to yield obedience when none of the archbishops, bishops, and prelates of the Holy Empire have had a share in the so-called decrees.’ What confusion of ideas existed also among the Catholic princes is evidenced by the fact that Duke Albert of Bavaria, and even the Emperor, declared that a Council at which the Protestant imperial princes and other Protestant powers, such as England, Scotland, Denmark, Sweden, and Switzerland, were not represented, could not be considered a General Ecumenical Council.²

Among the ‘ measures of reform ’ proposed by the Emperor and Duke Albert was the demand for the lay chalice. It was considered of the utmost importance that this point should be conceded, because hopes were cherished that multitudes of wavering Catholics would thereby be strengthened anew in the faith, and that

¹ ¹ Bucholtz, viii. 562.

² See the letters of Albrecht and Ferdinand, in Sickel, pp. 130–139.

numbers of Protestants who had attached themselves to the new doctrines for the sake of the Communion under both kinds would be brought back to the Church. It had been dogmatically decreed by the Council that 'The reception of both elements is not incumbent on all Christians, either in obedience to a divine command or as a means to salvation ; the Church had her reasons for introducing communion in one kind only among the laity and the non-celebrating priests, and in so doing she did not err ; the whole Christ is contained in each of the elements.'¹ But that the Church had power again, unconditionally, to sanction the reception of both elements by Christians in general was at once emphatically acknowledged by the most decided opponents of the lay chalice, notably the general of the Jesuits, Lainez. On the Abbot Riccardo of Vercelli's expressing his opinion that the demand for the chalice 'smacked of heresy,' the papal legate, who was presiding, reproved him for the offence against the Emperor which was implied in this statement, and imposed silence on him. The great question, as Lainez most forcibly pointed out, was the practical advisability of the measure ; but, he said, in the settlement of the matter, neither the Council nor the Pope must be credited with infallibility.

'The question of practical advisability' led to lengthy and more or less stormy proceedings. 'No

¹ The Church teaches that in the holy Eucharist the *glorified* body of the Lord, no longer capable of suffering, no longer subject to any sort of separation, is present : from this it follows that, both in the form of bread and in the form of wine, the whole undivided Christ must be equally present. The variety of elements in the holy sacrifice of the Mass is only intended to represent mystically the death of the Lord, which took place on the cross by separation of His blood from His not yet glorified body.

single point at the Council,' wrote the imperial ambassadors, 'was discussed with such tremendous excitement and noise.' The legates and Pius IV. were inclined to concede the chalice.¹ The Emperor—so said the first Cardinal legate—was most hopeful that this concession would bring back the heretics and those who had wavered in the faith; if the concession were not granted, Ferdinand, as his orators had already informed the Council, would withdraw his protection and leave the assembly to its unlucky fate.² But a largely preponderating majority of the fathers voted against the imperial demand. They negatived the question of the legates, 'whether the reception of both elements under certain conditions should be allowed by the Council,' and they could not be induced to give the positive assent demanded of them to the reception of the chalice. At a session of September 17, 1562, they placed 'the whole matter in the hands of his Holiness the Pope, in order that he in his wisdom, and according to his own judgment, should state expressly what he considered best for the welfare of Christendom and for the salvation of those who demanded the chalice.'³

In this adverse decision the fathers had been chiefly influenced by their knowledge that the concession of the lay chalice by the Council of Basle, and again by Paul III., had by no means checked, but rather encouraged, apostasy.

'The chalice,' Bishop Stanislaus Hosius had written in 1558, 'is the first wedge which begins the cleavage; the next is the Augsburg Confession.'⁴ Hosius wrote

¹ Grisar, *Erste Abhandlung*, pp. 676 f.

² Pallavicini, lib. 18, c. 3, No. 2.

³ Grisar, *Zweite Abhandlung*, pp. 89, 105–109.

⁴ Raynald ad a. 1558, No. 17.

to Duke Albert of Bavaria that it was not the lay chalice which was really the gist of the religious disputes, but the principal and fundamental article of the faith ‘in which we acknowledge our belief in a holy and universal Church.’ Whoever really and truly believed this, he said, was bound to submit his judgment to that of the Church. ‘The use of the chalice has never been condemned by the Church ; on the contrary, the Church’s decision was that, if anybody communicated, whether under one species or under both, provided that the act was done according to the usage of the Church, and not unworthily, it would work for the salvation of the communicant. The Church, however, had condemned the error of those who either denied that the whole undivided Christ was contained as much in one element as in the other, or who considered the use of the chalice so indispensable to eternal salvation, that they excluded communicants in one kind only from all hope of salvation, as violators of a divine command.’ There was danger that the concession of the chalice would strengthen and confirm one or other of these errors. The demand for the chalice was only the beginning of the breach, as might plainly be seen in the Empire, where, not content with the Augsburg Confession, people were striding on from one innovation to another. Calvinism, which denied the actual presence of Christ in the Sacrament, was spreading far and wide over Germany ; people were also beginning to deny that Christ had become incarnate through the Virgin Mary.¹ ‘Only see how far these dissentients have already gone. Some of them deny the humanity, some, as attested, among others, by Brenz in his book against Peter

¹ Bucholtz, viii. 657.

Martyr, the divinity of Christ. This extremity, however, was not reached at one bound, but step by step. The separation from the Church had begun with the chalice. After the first downward step had been taken, it was impossible to arrest the whole precipitous descent.¹

Among the German archbishops and bishops, whose opinion the Emperor solicited, those of Mayence and Cologne decided against the lay chalice, saying that to grant it would be to strengthen in their error those who thought that one element did not contain as much as the two together; the Church would then be accused of error, inconstancy, or impiety, as though she had formerly not dispensed this sacrament aright; and it would, moreover, be very easy to fall into the error of the Nestorians who taught that the Body of Christ was divisible. The benefit to be hoped for from the concession was decidedly less than the danger to be feared.²

The words spoken by Lainéz at the Council, that, if the chalice was conceded, those who were estranged from the Church would make still greater and more importunate demands, were by degrees justified.³

In a brief of April 16, 1564, Pius IV., in consequence of long and urgent pressure from the Emperor and Duke Albert, authorised all the German bishops to administer the Eucharist in both kinds to all those of the laity who demanded it, and who were ready to fulfil certain con-

¹ *Hosii Opp.* ii. 215-216.

² Bucholtz, viii. 664. Saftien, *Verhandlungen*, pp. 12 f., 14 f., where there are fuller details respecting the memorandum of advice which Ferdinand I. obtained from the Catholic scholars (Canisius and the Jesuits of Prague and Vienna were against the lay chalice, Staphylus and Gienger in favour of it), and the transactions with the Electors, with Salzburg, and with Bavaria. The dogmatic conclusions of Saftien are in many cases quite erroneous.

³ Grisar, p. 68.

ditions. These conditions were the acknowledgment of the dogma that the whole Christ was contained as much in one of the elements as in both; and the rejection of all false notions which had divided them from the faith and allegiance of the Church.¹

This brief was proclaimed with solemnity in Austria, and the result seemed at first propitious for the maintenance of the ancient Church system. But in the very same year, 1564, it became evident that the adherents of the new doctrine were only using the papal sanction as a decoy to catch other Catholics, and a means of establishing the Augsburg Confession.² The same experience was met with in Bavaria.

If we wish to know what judgment the Protestants formed of the papal concession, we may turn, among other sources of information, to a letter from the Elector Palatine Frederic to Duke John William of Saxony, where we read: ‘This concession is a work of the devil; were it but for this reason, that the Pope, who is the apostle of the devil, retains to himself auricular confession in order that he may reserve for Satan, his own father, a morsel of all the consciences of the poor Christians.’ The whole business ‘is so subtle in its venomous iniquity, that many a poor simple-minded creature cannot rightly understand it, and will imagine he has got a very lucky bargain, when all the time he

¹ Saftien, *Verhandlungen*, pp. 49 f.

² Fuller details on the introduction of the lay chalice in the imperial hereditary lands in Saftien, pp. 65 f. Respecting the results in Silesia, Jungnitz in his *Archidiakonus Petrus Gebauer: ein Zeit- und Lebensbild aus der schlesischen Kirchengeschichte des 17. Jahrhunderts*, 1892, p. 61. It had been hoped in Silesia that the concession of the lay chalice would save the Catholics from apostasy; but this measure only facilitated and encouraged their desertion of the Church, as the transit to Protestantism could be made unobserved.

is being caught in the wiles of the devil and his apostle by accepting this concession.'¹ ‘Beware,’ said a preacher to his congregation, ‘beware of the crafty, hellish snare which the accursed diabolical whoremonger at Rome has laid for you with the chalice.’ And again: ‘How has God’s anger waxed terrible, that He should allow the devil and his apostle, who has been spewed out of hell, to do such a thing as this in order to perplex and bewilder the evangelical Christians, and draw them down into the abyss of hell by means of this papistical chalice! Those who would wish to profit by this concession verily have devils’ mouths.’ The preacher, who described himself as ‘a peace-loving servant of the Holy Gospel,’ appealed frequently to the Holy Scriptures in confirmation of his assertions.²

The Protestant judgment on the sanction of the marriage of the clergy would have been precisely similar if the concession had come from the Council or from the Pope. Years ago Luther had said: ‘If it should happen that one, two, a hundred, a thousand, or any number of Councils you like, were to settle that the clergy are free to marry, or free to do or leave undone anything else that God’s Word has already given them leave to do or not to do, I, for my part, would be more inclined to look leniently on, and to commit to the tender mercies of God, the man who all his life long had kept one, two, or three concubines, than him who should take to himself a lawful wife on the strength of the decrees

¹ Letter of July 26, 1564, in Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 517–518.

² *Neue Funde und Auskotzungen des Satans, &c., den getrewen Christen zur Warnung gestellt durch einen friedfertigen Diener des hl. Evangelii* (1564), A³, C.

of any number of Councils, but who, without their decrees, would not dare to marry ; and in the name of God I would advise, and even command, all monks and priests, at peril of their souls' salvation, not to enter into wedlock on the strength of the decrees of Councils, but to continue in their vows of chastity, and, if this should be impossible for them, not to despair in their weakness and sin, but to call on God for succour.'¹

That the introduction of marriage among the clergy heightened the esteem in which the clerical state was held by the Protestant populace can by no means be maintained ; on the contrary, complaints became universal of the contempt with which the ministers of religion were regarded. In the words of Luther : 'The people see no good whatever in the servants of the Church ; those who live in the married state are despised and ejected ; the clergy have become a curse, scapegoats, and a butt of ridicule and contempt to everybody.'² The people still continued to regard the marriages among the clergy as unlawful, and even the Protestant jurists at Wittenberg refused for a long time to recognise the children of such marriages as legitimate, and as entitled to inherit from their parents. 'I myself,' Luther complained in 1536, 'have not yet met with one jurist who will side with me against the Pope in such cases, so that I cannot look to bequeathing my good name and my beggarly possessions to my own children, nor indeed can any priest.'³

In the territories of Catholic rulers also, the popular

¹ *Collected Works*, pp. 29, 23. See Vol. ii. 283 (German).

² See Luther's numerous utterances on this subject in Döllinger, i. 298 f.

³ De Wette, *Luther's Letters*, v. 26. See v. 716.

contempt for the incontinent clergy—whether legally married or living in concubinage was all the same—had risen to the highest pitch. Cases of the latter description had indeed become so numerous as to call forth especial condemnation from the Emperor and from Duke Albert of Bavaria, who, ‘in view of the melancholy conditions of the time,’ considered the abolition of celibacy ‘urgently necessary.’ It was their opinion that if the Pope or the Council were to sanction marriage among the priesthood, so that no blame should any longer attach to the clergy who had wives, concubinage would disappear, and the people ‘would regain their old reverence for the priests who were lawfully married with the sanction of the Church.’

Ferdinand represented to the Pope and the Council that ‘the desire for marriage’ had spread so enormously among the Catholic clergy in Germany, that out of a hundred pastors there was scarcely one who was not either openly or secretly married. If all these clergymen were deposed, the churches must either remain empty for want of other men to fill their places, or else the priests, in order not to lose their livings, would go over to the Protestants, and make common cause with them against the Catholic Church, and the bishops themselves, for want of clergy to work in their dioceses, would be driven to forsaking their flocks. For all these reasons, he urged, it would be better also to promote married men to the priesthood than to leave parishes without shepherds and to hand the country over to the enemies of the Church.¹

¹ Raynald ad a. 1562, No. 60; ad a. 1563, Nos. 138, 139; ad a. 1564, No. 29. How far Ferdinand’s statements correspond to truth remains yet to be discovered. The interesting and important fact, which has

The Duke of Bavaria's delegate spoke even more strongly. He said that nearly all the clergy had either wives or concubines. Concubinage was such an offence to the people that both priesthood and priests, religion and the teachers of religion, were utterly abhorred by them, and they would rather go over to any sect than return to the Church. Some few bishops, it was true, had endeavoured to remedy the evil, but the greater number of the heads of the Church maintained an attitude of indifference and inaction. The ancient, stringent Church rules could no longer be rigidly adhered

only lately come to light, that the Catholic clergy of that period were undoubtedly better in some districts than the friends of marriage among the priesthood assert, warns us to be careful. When, in April 1561, the Nuncio Commendone arrived at the court of Duke William of Jülich, he was assured by the Duke that there were not five clerics in the whole of his territory who were not living in open concubinage (Lossen, *Briefe von Andreas Masius und seinen Freunden*, Leipzig, 1886, p. 332). These words have been repeated since then times without number, but, according to the researches of H. H. Koch (*Die Reformation in Herzogthum Jülich*, 2. Heft, Frankfurt, 1888, pp. 83 f.), they are not in harmony with truth. 'The sole source,' says Koch, 'from which the Duke could get true information respecting the condition of morals among his clergy were the protocols of the church visitations made by his officials. These had been held in the years 1559 and 1560; in Jülich in 1559.' Koch went carefully through the visitation protocols of 1559 in the Düsseldorf archives of state, which give statistics concerning thirty-five neighbouring churches and chapels, which had fifty-four clergymen among them (see Koch, *loc. cit.*; Heft 2, p. 84, and Heft 3 [1896], p. 168). 'The visiting inspectors took special pains to collect minute information respecting the moral conditions of these parishes, and this in the absence of the incumbents and without giving the latter the opportunity of justifying themselves. The information they obtained consisted thus of one-sided complaints and accusations, which were possibly all at variance with truth, but nevertheless were an accurate expression of public opinion, and that was the chief concern.' And what is the result? Out of the 54 clergymen, 32 are given good characters and only 6 bad ones, while 13 are neither commended nor blamed, so that there could have been nothing against their characters; the remaining three are set down as doubtful cases. The above-mentioned words of the Duke are therefore in flat contradiction to verified facts and have no claim on our belief.

to. Many thoughtful men, who had a complete grasp of German social and political conditions, saw, in the spirit of the age, the working of an occult force of nature,¹ which was impelling, not ardent youngsters only, but even Catholic men of mature age, to renounce their benefices for the sake of marrying, rather than enter or remain in the Church and not marry, and unite themselves with so profligate a class as were the clergy of the period. Hence the dearth of learned men among the ecclesiastics, hence the frightful ignorance of the clerics, hence the growing power of heresy and the impotence of the Church to resist it. The scarcity of learned and efficient ministers of religion could only be overcome by a moral resuscitation of the clergy, and this would be best accomplished by reverting to the custom of the primitive Church, and allowing married men to proclaim the Word of God and to receive holy orders. This concession must also be granted to the priests who had wives already. For there was no divine command that priests must be celibates. We know from history that, formerly, married men were not only made priests but also bishops.²

The speaker enforced his argument by an appeal to the Greek Church, in which, however, ‘marriage of the priesthood’ did not exist. Ever since the synod of Constantinople, in the year 692, the Greek Church had conformed to the following rule: ‘Men already married

¹ ‘... esse nunc in Germania sæculum quandam occultam naturæ vim.’

² Raynald ad a. 1562, No. 52. See Schlecht, in the *Hist. Jahrb.* xiii. 626 (*Zur Berichtigung von Knöpfler, Kelchbewegung* 109). See also *Histor. Jahrb.* xiii. 144 ff.: Schwarz, ‘Der erste Antrag Albrechts V. von Baiern an den apostol. Stuhl auf Bewilligung des Laienkelches, Zulassung der Priesterehe und Milderung des Fastengebotes,’ 1555.

may become priests and retain their wives on condition that they have not married a second time, and that they have not married widows or women of bad repute. An unmarried man, who has received one of the highest orders, must not afterwards marry. Also, no priest whose wife has died after his ordination is at liberty to marry again. If a married man is consecrated a bishop, his wife must go into a convent.¹

Among the German bishops, Frederic Nausea of Vienna, Julius Pfug of Naumburg, Michael Helding of Merseburg were advocates of the measure for abolishing celibacy. In a memorandum presented by them to Ferdinand, they expressed their opinion that in view of the many and great scandals in the ecclesiastical ranks, and also of the deplorable dearth of priests, it was desirable that the clergy should be allowed to marry under certain conditions.² Never, however, the Archbishop of Cologne declared to the Emperor, had such a thing been heard of in the Church as priests taking to themselves wives after their ordination. The defenders of celibacy urged that the scandals in the Church were no more an argument against celibacy than adultery, the terrible increase of which was everywhere bewailed, was an argument against marriage. Not only the laws of man, but also those of God were more and more frequently outraged nowadays, owing to the increasing demoralisation of the people. It by no means followed, however, that these laws should be abolished. Married priests do not command the confidence of the people in

¹ Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* (2 Aufl.) Bd. iii. 331-333.

² See Schmidt, *Neuere Gesch.* iv. 42-47. Nausea had already proposed to Pope Paul III. in 1543 to remove the compulsory character of celibacy. See Metzner, *Fr. Nausea*, pp. 78-80. See also Saftien, *Verhandlungen*, p. 14.

the administration of the sacrament of penance. If those men who, in violation of their vows and in disobedience to the Church's command, have kept concubines are permitted to have lawful wives, it will be as good as granting them rewards for their immoral conduct. They ought rather to be punished with the full rigour of the canon law, so that it may not appear as though their sinning had been profitable to them. The sin of incontinency, the Archbishop of Mayence urged emphatically, was becoming apparent, not only among the Catholic clergy, but also among those Protestant ministers of religion who were living in so-called wedlock. Once let celibacy go, and a complete change in the condition of the clerical state would follow, and the Church goods would all be confiscated.

At a conference held in August 1563, by the Emperor's councillors, the three ecclesiastical electors, the Archbishop of Salzburg, and the Duke of Bavaria, it was agreed, 'in the question of celibacy, not to appeal to the Council, but to propose to the Pope "that those who had already joined the priesthood should not be allowed to marry, for such a thing had never been heard of since the days of the Apostles; but that in this time of scarcity, pious married men should be admitted to perform priestly functions, though only in the parish churches; and that, in order to maintain celibacy in a position of respect, prelacies, canonries, and other benefices should not be bestowed on married men."'¹

At the Council not a single bishop spoke in favour of the abolition of celibacy; only the Hungarian bishop

¹ Bucholtz, viii. 668-680. See the Instructions of the Bishop of Münster, March 1563, in Hüsing, p. 165.

Andreas Dudith of Tina, who later on became a Protestant and married, had intended making a speech in support of marriage among the clergy.¹ The decree of the Council was as follows : ‘ If a sufficient number of unmarried clerics cannot be obtained for the functions of the four minor orders, married ones may then be received, provided they are men of blameless character, who have not been married twice, and who are fitted for the service of the Church. Clerics who have taken the higher orders, or monks who have taken the solemn vow of chastity, must not be allowed to marry.’² Severe penalties were decreed against concubinage,³ and minute rules for the official duties and the private conduct of the clergy. The Council further enjoined all bishops to found seminaries for training a body of clergy whose morals should be irreproachable.⁴

The Emperor and all the Catholic powers who sent representatives to the Council were most urgent in pressing for a thoroughgoing reform of the clergy of all ranks and degrees. Ferdinand made repeated demands for reform of the Roman Curia and the College of Cardinals, and for redress of the abuses of non-residence, simony, dissipation of Church goods, and plurality of benefices. He demanded also reform of the cloisters and the retraction of their exemptions, the abolition of the stole-fees, the compilation of a clear manual of Catholic doctrine, a new postille (book of sermons) and agenda (ritual and ceremonial guide-books), and, above

¹ *Excusatio ad Maximilianum Cæsarem*, p. 38. De Thou states erroneously that he actually made the speech (Menzel, ii. 393, note).

² Sessio 23, cap. 17 ; Sessio 24, cap. 9.

³ Sessio 24, cap. 8 ; Sessio 25, cap. 15.

⁴ Fuller details later on.

all, the erection of good schools and the foundation of stipends for poor scholars.¹ The Pope was ready for all these reforms. ‘Act as you think best,’ he wrote to one of the legates; ‘we shall not fail to co-operate with you and to carry out whatever is agreed upon for the glory of God and the general welfare.’ ‘In so far as it can be done with equity and honour,’ he said, ‘the demands of the secular sovereigns must be satisfied.’ The legates were not to lose time by referring to him for his opinion, but to settle everything with the synod, and to strive after the best possible issues. With regard also to the College of Cardinals, they were to proceed without any compunction of any sort; no measures of reform would be too stringent for him, for in this respect also he wished to give satisfaction to the Council and to the princes.²

‘His Holiness,’ Cardinal Otto of Augsburg wrote from Rome on September 17, 1563, ‘is indefatigable in his ardour for reform of all sorts, in matters that concern himself personally, as well as in the business of the Curia, and in all the affairs of the Church, whose members, both high and low, he would gladly bring back to the ancient discipline and moral standard. But the improvement so urgently needed in the lives of the clergy, the restoration of Church ordinances and laws—in short, the whole business of Church reform—will not be carried through, or at any rate very inadequately, without a simultaneous reform of the princes and their mode of government, and unless the Church is freed from the heavy secular bondage under which she is

¹ Raynald ad a. 1562, No. 59. Schelhorn, *Amoenitates*, i. 501–575. See Reimann’s *Aufsatzz in den Forschungen zur deutschen Gesch.* viii. 177–186. Bucholtz, viii. 446–454.

² Bucholtz, viii. 476–477, 601–602.

more or less crushed and oppressed in every German State. Is it exaggeration to assert that in the Catholic territories also, it is less the bishops who rule the Church than the princes and their officials ?' ¹

In the main, this assertion was not an exaggeration.

It was not to be expected that Catholic princes would give in to the Protestant idea that the power of the secular rulers was the sole authority that was based on divine right, and that all ecclesiastical power was to be regarded as derived from territorial sovereignty, and princes and municipal authorities as chief bishops of the territorial churches. Nevertheless, among the Catholic rulers, long before the Protestant movement began, many adhered to the teaching of the Roman jurists, that the 'externals of the Church' ought to be entirely subject to the territorial sovereign, who had the right freely to dispose of the goods of the Church, to make all appointments to benefices, and to exercise control over all Church ordinances.² The secular princes and nobles, says a pamphlet of 1524, 'want to be lords of the Church, to hold the richest benefices and Church livings, and to have little or no work to do ; to appoint the clergy at their own will, and to demand payment for the appointment ; they bring disorder into abbeys and cloisters ; they banquet and gormandise out of Church funds, and then talk as if they were the saints of the earth, and complain of the corruption of the clergy. Oh, these Pharisees, through whom God is now plaguing the Christian people most bitterly !' 'The princes,' says another contemporary writer of deep

¹ To the Cologne Jesuit, John of Reidt. See above, p. 40, n. 3.

² As early as the 14th and 15th centuries several princes laid claim to 'papal authority' within their dominions. See our statements, Vol. ii. (Eng.) 284-286.

insight, ‘bring up grievance after grievance against the clerics, the greater number of whom they themselves have, by fair means or foul, placed in their parishes and benefices. They blame the Church, while it is they themselves who have given her the Judas kiss.’¹ ‘If only we can get our sons, our brothers, and our friends appointed to episcopal posts and dignities,’ wrote the Catholic Duke George the Bearded of Saxony, ‘we care little whether they enter at the door or how they get in, so long as they get in—whether under the threshold or down through the roof, it matters not. This is the common practice with us princes, as though we held our power for the sake of forcing our way to hell. Moreover, these lords who get into the Church in this way behave as though they had purchased themselves a family inheritance and held it by right.’

‘When we laymen,’ the Duke goes on, ‘have the property of cloisters and religious institutions under our control, we become so inflamed with covetousness that we often think far more of how we can get the property into our own possession, in order to maintain our social position, than of seeing to it that orderly Christian living goes on in the districts under our care. This greed of possession has, in these last troublous times, served to break up many Christian communities, and to increase the revenues of the rulers. Herein we have forgotten our duty to God and our neighbour, and have cared no whit whether our neighbour came to eternal damnation, so long as we could keep up the splendour of our state.’²

¹ See our statements, Vol. iv. 25–26.

² Höfler, *Denkwürdigkeiten der Charitas Pirkheimer*, p. 58. See our statements, Vol. iv. 28.

The following words, written by Luther, were entirely applicable to most of the Catholic princes and nobles : ‘ The irascible young noblemen and the princes are the very best of Lutherans ; they take presents and money in abundance from the abbeys and cloisters, appropriate the Church jewels and precious stones, and cast covetous glances on the glebe lands. Besides which, they encroach on the papal rights and immunities, and tax and oppress the spiritual Estates and persons as much as they like. But where do they learn all these practices ? In the Pope’s books ? Did they though ? Don’t believe it ! It was Luther who bestowed this freedom on them, and what thanks or glory has he got for his pains ? ’¹

To meet the necessities of the moment, the services of individual princes had from time to time been enlisted by the Popes themselves to help in the settling of purely ecclesiastical matters. For instance, Pope Adrian VI., in consequence of the Bavarian bishops’ tardiness in attempting to restore Church discipline, had authorised the Duke of Bavaria, in 1523, to proceed against all culpable clerics by means of an ecclesiastical commission (without the concurrence of the ordinaries), which should visit all the cloisters of the land and depose unworthy superiors.² A practice that could only be justified by the needs of the time soon came to be looked on as ‘ a standing right of the territorial rulers, who, in cases where belief itself was not involved, had a right to rule at their pleasure over ecclesiastical persons and their possessions.’

In the Catholic territories also there was no respect

¹ *Collected Works*, xxx. 377.

² See our statements, vol. iv. 20.

shown to the fundamental principles of ecclesiastical law, according to which Church property belongs to the corporate ecclesiastical body, individual members being only entitled to the usufructs. Such being the case, there could be no legitimate confiscation of Church property by the secular power, or any reversion of it to the Crown. In Austria and Bavaria it was declared that Church property was only Crown property, and the prelates only Crown officials. Some of the prelates were obsequious and servile enough to speak of the goods entrusted to them as ‘Crown property,’ the administration of which was bestowed on them solely by the reigning princes.¹

Complaints were made that it was principally ‘the bailiffs, magistrates, and other officials of the Catholic princes who play fast and loose with Church goods, endowments, tithes, bequests to the poor, baptisms and Eucharists (? *Gottesessen*), charitable meals, and so forth, and they are often more greedy and grasping than the Lutherans ; they oppress the clergy as though they were bondsmen, tear up the charters, starve the hospitals, while they themselves feast in the hospitals and almshouses during their visits of inspection.’² The Emperor Ferdinand, who had complained at the Council of the manner in which unprincipled prelates squandered the Church revenues, had been obliged, in 1548, to admonish his bailiffs in Austria as follows : ‘I have been credibly informed that some of your number help yourselves to the ecclesiastical goods and without regard to

¹ See Biedermann, ‘Aus der kameralistischen Praxis des Jahrhundertes,’ in Müller und Falke’s *Zeitschr. für deutsche Kulturgesch.*, Jahrg. 1858, pp. 362 f.

² In the Christliche Klage- und Trostschrift (18-19) referred to at p. 92, note 1.

rights of inheritance, debts, or other considerations, use them wholly, or in part, just as it pleases you. Such disgraceful and grievous abuse of trust on your part has made the clergy not a little timid of accepting parishes, benefices, and abbacies ; so that these, nowadays, remain unoccupied, and the common people are deprived, in these parlous times, of the Word and worship of God, and they suffer injury in soul and body.'¹

Ferdinand's son, King Maximilian, ' who made no secret of his loathing for the dishonest prelates who diverted the Church revenues and endowments from the purposes they were intended for, and applied them to their own use, when he became emperor, sold the fourth part of the Church possessions for his own profit, made heavy drags on the cloisters to remunerate his court officials, and gave ecclesiastical benefices to laymen.' Now it was a court musician and his wife who had to be richly provided for out of Church revenues ; now an architect ' was appointed to the first vacant benefice ; ' now an imperial councillor was to be rewarded ' with some ecclesiastical prize—either a parish or a fat benefice.'² Maximilian was also ' equally disgusted at the idea of the clergy meddling with temporal affairs, for that sort of thing never led to any good ; ' but he considered it quite fitting and legitimate that he himself should prescribe to bishops and cloisters, under pain of threatened punishment, how many Masses they were to say, what collections they were to make, how the canonical hours were to be performed, and the Sacraments administered. ' In Austria the bishops lost the respect of the people ; the ordination of priests and the

¹ Wiedemann, i. 96-97.

² *Ibid.* i. 206-208.

consecration of churches were the only powers left to them.'¹

The right claimed by some of the princes, on the ground of their princely superiority, to quarter on the monasteries, at their pleasure, retinues of 'huntsmen, falconers, grooms, and other servants,' worked sad ruin in monastic life. 'These people,' it was complained, 'go on eating and drinking day and night, bring women with them, and are never satisfied.' The Bavarian provincial deputies complained, in 1543, that 'they introduce all sorts of profligacy and evil into the monasteries, and they think themselves entitled, they and those they bring with them, to be waited on day and night, and supplied with the very best food and drink.' In the year 1528 the Dukes of Bavaria had sternly interdicted 'all the iniquitous proceedings and illegal acts that were carried on in the monasteries;' but the orders had been 'as empty wind.'²

The clergy were of opinion that 'all this unchristian insubordination, as well as the popular contempt for the clergy,' had been chiefly brought about by the exercise of the *jus spolii* (the pretended right to seize on the goods of clerics after their death; also called *rips raps*, from the Latin *rapite, capite*), through the princes' officials and the nobles. 'It is no slight grievance,' said a Passau clergyman, 'that the very moment a country parish priest dies—indeed, almost before the breath has left his body—the parsonage is besieged with officers of the secular law, who fall to feasting as at a village fair, devouring the poor man's substance, and

¹ Klehsl's *Denkschrift* in von Hammer-Purgstall, 1, *Urkunden*, pp. 308-313.

² See Sugenheim *Baierns Zustände*, pp. 265-266, and our statements, vol. iv. 20-25.

making such a hole in his legacies that very often there is not enough left to pay the ordinary his rightful fee, or to satisfy the dead priest's creditors. And, besides all this, these vultures actually have the insolence to tell the priests mockingly beforehand that after their death they intend to have fine carousals at their parsonages.' Complaints on this score were made repeatedly at the Bavarian provincial assemblies. For instance : ' If it leaks out that a parish pastor or other priest has left property behind at his death, the civil authorities at once lay hands on it, snap their fingers at creditors, heirs, and others, put them off with delays, charge them exorbitant costs, and, in short, drag the matter on till very often the whole legacy ends in smoke.' It was the practice of the nobles to grab to themselves either the whole or a part of the property left by the clergy who lived in their bailiwicks or held livings under their patronage. All the complaints made at synods respecting these encroachments of the territorial princes and nobles were entirely fruitless.¹

In other Catholic countries, especially in France, in the kingdom of Naples, in Sicily, and in Spain, the bondage of the Church was even more glaring.

The Council was therefore completely in its right in demanding, as a necessary preliminary to general reform, the 'removal of the obstacles set up by the secular authorities.' Pope Pius IV. told the Spanish ambassador in the spring of 1563 that he was quite ready for a general reform, but he hoped that King Philip and the other temporal princes would not be excluded from the scope of operations.²

¹ Sugenheim, *Baierns Zustände*, pp. 267-271.

² Bucholtz, viii. 607, note.

The following stipulations were drawn up at Trent. The princes, under pain of excommunication, were commanded not to interfere in purely spiritual matters, and to respect the traditional privileges of the Church. Free administration of justice, freedom in all matters directly or indirectly appertaining to the ecclesiastical forum, and, under certain given conditions, freedom from unlawfully imposed contributions, taxes, and services, were claimed as rights of the Church. The imposition of these on ecclesiastics had been unlawful. The princes were not to bestow benefices on prelates and canons, or in any way hold out to them the prospect of ecclesiastical preferment, and they were to leave intact all ecclesiastical property and rights, as also all property and rights of laymen who were under Church patronage. They were no longer to be allowed to quarter their servants, soldiers, horses, and dogs on the houses of the clergy or monasteries ; and, finally, their practice of affixing their ‘ princely Exequatur or Placet ’ to ecclesiastical edicts was to be given up.¹

These articles of reform, which were sent to the ambassadors of all the temporal sovereigns in August 1563, occasioned ‘ the most violent storm and strife ’—so wrote the Cardinal-Bishop Otto of Augsburg on September 17—‘ and threatened to bring about the complete collapse of the Council, or, at any rate, the withdrawal of the Catholic potentates’ support.’ ‘ The Emperor,’ Otto adds, ‘ although by nature discreet and moderate, is in the highest measure displeased, and prognosticates risings and disturbances in Germany if these articles are not given up or held back till a more opportune season.

¹ *Reformartikel*, in Le Plat, vi. 227–233 ; Bucholtz, *Urkundenband*, pp. 703–705.

The King of Spain declares his intention of recalling his bishops if the royal rights and privileges (as he called the violent proceedings against the Church) are in any way tampered with at the Council. The King of France, or rather the counsellors of this *child*, are behaving as though possessed by devils, and give reason to fear that France is completely severing herself from obedience to the Apostolic See. Uninterruptedly, vehemently, passionately, the princes and their councillors and delegates have clamoured for reforms ; but the moment there is a hint of any change which will affect their own proceedings or authority, they cry out as though the house were on fire, and pronounce everything that they themselves do, or lay claim to, unimpeachable.¹

No sooner had the French King heard of the reform articles, than he sent instructions to his ambassadors to oppose them with all their might, and, ‘if their protests failed of effect,’ to leave the Council forthwith. The French bishops, also, in this case, were to come away at once. The fathers at the Council, he said, seemed bent on ‘cutting the claws of all the kings and sharpening their own ;’ but he had no intention of allowing his rights and ‘liberties’ to be infringed in the very slightest degree. The power of the Council was limited to the reform of the ecclesiastical body, and it had no right to intrude on affairs of State and royal prerogatives.²

On September 22 the French ambassador de Ferrier delivered a speech in full session, which caused general excitement. By means of the reform devices, he declared, among other things, a blow was being struck at the liberties of the Gallican Church and the majesty and

¹ See the letter cited at p. 164, note 1.

² *Die Briefe Carl's IX.* of August 28, 1563, in Le Plat, vi. 194–198.

authority of the Most Christian kings. For centuries past these sovereigns had framed ecclesiastical laws which had never been at variance with dogma or injurious to the freedom of the bishops. For the bishops had never been prevented from residing the whole year in their dioceses ; from proclaiming the pure Word of God every day ; from living sober, temperate, godly lives ; and from distributing the goods of the Church among the poor. The poor were the veritable lords of these goods. But here he must correct himself. These Most Christian kings had founded nearly all the churches, and as the rulers of France had authority over all the possessions and revenues of their subjects in general, so also they had the right to exercise free control over the clergy, when the necessity and the well-being of the State required them to do so. And, moreover, they held this right, this power, this authority, not from men, but from God, who had given mankind kings to be obeyed by them. The fathers must therefore attempt nothing against these royal rights and against the Gallican liberties, or else, de Ferrier signified, ‘ we have orders to interpose a veto, as indeed we are now doing.’

The next day Charles Grassi, Bishop of Montefiascone, replied as follows : ‘ It was an unheard-of thing, at an *Œcuménical Council*, that the ambassador of a Christian king should talk of a veto, which recalled to mind the proceedings of the people’s tribunes in pagan Rome. So, then, ecclesiastical freedom was to be no more than this—that bishops and priests would not be prevented by royal laws from proclaiming the pure Word of God and distributing alms, while over and above this it was a matter of perfect indifference

that the entire freedom and jurisdiction of the Church should be made over to the kings, the Church goods squandered, and bishops and priests judged by secular tribunals, all which was in direct opposition to apostolic traditions, and to the decrees of Popes and Councils, in opposition also to the Council of Constance. It was impossible to believe, he said, that the ambassador had really spoken according to the King's instructions.'

The Cardinal-Legate Morone said it was an impious assertion that the King had the right of control over all the possessions of his subjects, and that no bishop was at liberty to gainsay him when he appropriated Church property.¹

The imperial ambassadors wrote to Ferdinand that de Ferrier had said much that was excellent on the question of reform, but that he had seriously offended all the fathers by speaking of the King's undoubted right of control over his subjects' property, and by protesting against the curtailment of the royal prerogatives.² De Ferrier reported to Paris that the imperial ambassadors, and also those of the King of Spain and of Venice, had expressed their complete satisfaction with his speech. He once more asserted emphatically that the French kings, 'n cases of 'urgent necessity,' possessed full power over all their subjects and their subjects' goods and chattels, and also over the clergy and Church property.³ Charles IX. was in full agreement with his ambassadors. 'The Most Christian kings' could not 'allow their hands to be tied' in the constantly occurring cases of 'urgent need' when it was a question of paying royal debts out of Church revenues,

¹ *Die Reden*, in Le Plat, vi. 233-237, 241-245.

² Sickel, p. 606.

³ Le Plat, vi. 249-250.

or of making provision for royal bastards, favourites, or mistresses.¹

The Government of Lower Austria, consulted by Ferdinand with regard to several of the decrees formulated at Trent, and concerning the articles of reform for the princes, advised the Emperor most strongly to consent to none of the decisions of the Council. The ecclesiastical synods, such as were under consideration, ought only to be held under the direction of secular commissioners, so that the business might be conducted in an orderly manner, and nothing decreed that was prejudicial to the country and the people. Church visitations ought not to be held ‘so long as there was everywhere schism in religion, and nobody knew on what basis the visitations should be conducted. The article which laid down that “in penal matters which concern punishment in person or in goods, the bishops are not to be sentenced by any one except the Pope,” was a decided grievance, and the Emperor must not allow

¹ The Venetian ambassador, Giovanni Correro, who was at the French Court from 1566 to 1569, says of Charles IX.: ‘Pare bella cosa a quella maestà, col distribuire cento sei vescovadi, quattordici arcivescovadi, sei in sette cento abbazie, ed altrettanti priorati, potere, senza metter mano alla borsa, pagar debiti, far mercedi, maritar dame, e gratificiar signori: e l'abuso è camminato tanto innanzi, che si fa così bene mercanzia di vescovati e d'abbazie a quella corte, come si fa qui di pevere e di cannella’ (Alberi, ser. 1, Vol. iv. 192). A bastard of Charles IX., Charles de Valois, was made abbot *in commendam* of Chaise-Dieu, and enjoyed the revenues of the monastery even after his marriage. Bussy d'Amboise, the most good-for-nothing man of his day, was granted the abbey of Bourgueil, as the favourite of Henry III. Henry IV. bestowed the revenues of the abbey of Châillon, where St. Bernard had been educated, on a woman of bad character. He bestowed an abbey on the Protestant Rosny, in return for his paying 50,000 thalers (crowns) to the King's mistress, Mlle. d'Entraigues. See Montalembert, *Mönche des Abendlandes*, translated by C. Brandes (Ratisbon, 1860), Vol. i. 161. ‘Favours’ of this sort were considered ‘indisputable rights of royal majesty.’

himself to be tied down in this way.' The article to the effect that 'at least half of the canonries attached to the higher benefices must be held by doctors or "licentiates" of theology, or of canon law,' would be opposed at the provincial diets by the nobles, for whom 'the higher benefices were intended.' Equally hard on the nobles was the clause stipulating that the canonries should be open to strangers and men not belonging to the nobility. The holders of benefices would never consent to the 'needy churches being assisted by incorporation with benefices.' This measure could not be passed without their consent. The further stipulation 'that poor parishes or benefices, which could not maintain priests on account of the meagreness of their incomes, should receive a tenth part of the general revenues,' must also be cancelled; for the tithes ought not to be taken away from the laity. Another article also contained a stipulation which was very prejudicial to the Emperor, and to all overlords and subjects—viz. that within the space of twelve months the rights of patronage claimed by laymen over benefices must be proved before the respective ordinaries; for in case of the charters of such rights having been lost 'each layman would help himself to his dues and would be by no means ready to renounce them.' Nobody could be deprived of his having and holding without legal process. But such process would be impossible in that 'strange court of justice' before which the case would be brought. It was no less impolitic to entrust the bishops with the visitation and management of hospitals and almshouses. Above all, the Emperor must not consent to the stipulation that the Council should forbid secular rulers 'to appoint prelates or other dignitaries,

or to enjoy the usufructs and incomes of vacant churches and benefices.' For 'all Church property was Crown property, and all the cloisters had been founded and endowed by the predecessors of the Emperor and others.' The clause forbidding 'the servants of laymen, or *lands-knechts* (soldiers), or horses, or dogs to be housed in monasteries' was superfluous, for 'there were some monasteries which could well endure this so-called burden; the Emperor must therefore not let his hands be tied in this respect.'¹ The decree that the clergy must not be cited before or sentenced by lay tribunals was contrary to tradition and inherited rights. Further, the Council had not sufficient grounds for decreeing that henceforth 'the clergy were not to be molested on account of their decisions with regard to excommunication, and other matters,' for interference on the part of the secular power only happened when the ecclesiastical authorities did not act 'in accordance with the canons' and abused their rights. It would fall heavily on the Emperor, and on the authorities under him, 'if their hands were so tied as to prevent his examining into such cases or taking any action.' The article concerning the 'Exequatur and Placet' was also superfluous. The Austrian Government was determined not to allow the Church any freedom. At the end of the memorandum it was again emphatically urged that 'the Emperor must by no means agree to anything proposed by the Council without the consent of the Austrian Estates and of all the German imperial Estates, including the Protestants, otherwise insurrection might easily occur,

¹ The article in question runs as follows: 'Caveant, ne suos officiales, familiares, milites eorumve equos, canes in episcoporum clericorumve ac beneficiorum quorumcumque domibus, aut religiosorum monasteriis distribuant, sive pro eorum transitu aut vietu quidquam ab eis exigant.'

with the result of breeding still greater bitterness against the clergy.'¹

Ferdinand sent this memorandum to his ambassadors at Trent, in order that they might make 'the great difficulty of the matter clearer to the papal legates.' If the Austrian Government raised such objections, he said, how much greater obstacles would he not meet with in Bohemia, Hungary, and in the German Empire!² A canon of Mayence, who was travelling through Trent to Rome, had assured the imperial ambassadors that the article which admitted laymen to the cathedral chapters was in itself enough to produce great confusion in Germany.³

If further deliberations had been held respecting single clauses of the reform measures, many modifications and additions might have been made as concessions to the altered circumstances and conditions of a different age. But the potentates would none of them tolerate any discussion on the boundary line between temporal and spiritual power, or any readjustment of the relations between Church and State.

When the imperial ambassadors, in accordance with Ferdinand's instructions, urged that the articles should either be allowed to drop, or the settlement be postponed to another occasion, the Cardinal-Legate Morone said he wondered that the Emperor, who had always pressed so strongly for general reform, should now want to exclude the princes from its operation. After the Pope had gone to the length of giving up his prerogative, as it were, and investing the Council with authority

¹ The *Gutachten* of October 13, 1563, in Bucholtz, *Urkundenband*, pp. 706-716.

² Bucholtz, viii. 618.

³ *Ibid.* p. 606.

to decide everything without previous appeal to Rome, the Emperor actually wanted to decree that this or the other article must not be discussed.¹ The draft of reform decrees, Morone wrote to Ferdinand, had been ‘sent first to all the ambassadors, in order that it might be amended according to their suggestions before going up to the fathers. A few articles, against which they raised objections, have either been altered by us or entirely given up. We have urgently entreated each separate ambassador to give us his opinion on the matter. If, now, there still remains anything that one or other of them objects to, it is not our fault, but the fault of those who kept silence. To let the whole business fall through, however, or else postpone it, would be impossible without causing the greatest scandal and throwing everything into confusion.’ Nearly all the bishops were convinced that a reform of the whole body ecclesiastical could only be effected after removal of the hindrances from secular powers by which the bishops were completely crippled in their government of the Church. ‘If these obstacles were not removed, the reform measures would not only be defective, but would have no result whatever. All the trouble that your Majesty and we ourselves have taken will have been altogether thrown away.’ ‘The whole tenor of the scheme of reform corresponds not only to the canon law, but also to the laws framed by former pious emperors. It does not by any means include all the modes of oppression of the clergy, or of impugnment of ecclesiastical freedom ; on the contrary, in deference to the conditions of the age, everything that could possibly disturb the tranquillity of Germany, or be likely to hinder

¹ Bucholtz, viii. 610.

resistance against the hereditary enemy of Christendom, has been left out. Whereas the opponents of our true religion are bent on nothing so resolutely as on the ejection and annihilation of the bishops and the rest of the clergy, it is only fitting that the Council and the Catholic princes should support the ecclesiastical body in its services and protect its dignity, more especially as the decrees already issued, and those which are to follow, give us ground to hope that we may succeed in obtaining able, blameless, pious, and honourable men as bishops: bishops who possess no authority cannot be expected to lead the people back from vice to virtue, from erroneous teaching to true religion.'¹

No amount of representations to the secular powers was of any avail.

The prospect of the transactions at the Council coming to nothing filled multitudes of Catholics with 'the deepest anxiety.' 'Cardinal Carpi, Dean of the Sacred College, a really distinguished man,' the Venetian ambassador, Girolamo Soranzo, reported in 1563, 'told me that during his last illness he had prayed for death, so that he might not live to see the death and burial of Rome. Other cardinals of high standing are ceaselessly weeping and bewailing the misery of these times. They see no means of healing but through the direct interposition of the Almighty.'²

But, wrote the Cardinal-Bishop Otto of Augsburg, 'it is just when to human eyes everything seems darkest,

¹ August 28, 1563, in Sickel, pp. 588-590.

² Account of June 1563, in Albieri, ser. 2, Vol. iv. 82. See in the report of Galeazzo Cusano, May 1, 1563, the passage: '... che si può comprar hormai la cera per far l' esequio al cadavero della chiesa. . . .', Sickel, p. 496.

that we must trust most in the help of God. Christ the Lord still walks with Peter over the stormy waters.¹

While these transactions were going on at Trent, the decisions at Naumburg had only increased the religious anarchy among the Protestants.

¹ See above, p. 255, note 1.

CHAPTER XIII

RESULTS OF THE NAUMBURG CONVENTION—RELIGIOUS
AND MORAL CONDITIONS IN NORTH GERMANY

THE Flacians stood out as the ‘most furious antagonists’ of the Naumburg Resolutions. It had indeed been urged on them, so the theologians of Jena said at the assembly of princes, that ‘it would be better for them to unite their forces against the papacy than to bite and devour each other,’ but the corrupters of doctrine, in their own party, constituted in very truth this papacy, which they must first root out from among themselves, for the Holy Scriptures commanded the extirpation of all heresy; heretics within the fold were more dangerous than those without.¹ At a convention held at Lüneburg by the ecclesiastical and political delegates of the Nether Saxon Estates, Mörlin drew up the so-called ‘Lüneburg Articles’ in opposition to the Naumburg Resolutions, and he wrote to a friend: ‘Now, then, Wittenberg will roar, Heidelberg will rage, and Tübingen will look sour; but the entrails of Codrus may burst for all I care, so long as the purity of Christ’s teaching is maintained.’²

The Naumburg ‘Samaritan Interim’—that ‘strange piece of devil’s work’—was fiercely attacked in sermons and controversial pamphlets. Duke Christopher of

¹ Salig, iii. 674–675.

² Mönckeberg, pp. 177–178; Hachfeld, p. 20.

Würtemberg wrote that just as the divines of the duchy of Saxony ‘had formerly called him by name a godless man, so now, by the same, he and his Naumburg associates were again “cried down and insulted,” as though he were Belial himself, with whom no one ought to have any dealings, or as if, by subscribing to the Resolutions, he had joined himself to the company of Belial.’¹

‘The princes must not imagine,’ the Flacians at the university of Jena declared to Duke John Frederic, ‘although they have arrogated to themselves the goods of the Church and the right of appointing its officers, that they will be able to order the theologians and preachers like their own vassals, because they pay them their salaries out of the State Treasury. Secular rulers may command their secular subjects, but the servants of Christ stand under no orders but those of Christ.’ The consistory established by the Duke was the secular papacy foretold by Luther. Appealing to the example of Luther, who they said, had written ten times more virulently than they had against kings, the Flacians told the Duke that he was taking the reins out of Christ’s hands, and that he could only escape excommunication by humbling himself as Theodosius had done.² In answer to all this the Chancellor Brück presented himself at Jena on October 10, 1561, summoned the Flacian offenders to appear before him, and treated them to a violent tirade, calling them ‘black, red, and yellow good-for-nothing scoundrels, rascals, and popish villains.’ .

‘Miserable wretches and seditionmongers,’ he ex-

¹ Letter of November 21, 1561, to Duke John Frederic, in Pressel, *Anecdota*, pp. 493–498.

² Salig, iii. 852; Wilkens, p. 113.

claimed, ‘may some one haul you over the faggots, maim you, and blind you !’ Utterly unperturbed by these maledictions, Simon said in a sermon on October 13 : ‘ You great and exalted asses, who have hitherto protected and defended us, have the goodness now to leave us to ourselves, for you are all of you of the devil himself.’¹ Towards the end of the year 1561, Musäus, Matthew Judex, and John Wigand received their dismissal. Flacius felt that his life was not secure. The students set to work to storm his dwelling-place, and it was with difficulty that he saved himself by flight.²

His disappearance, however, did not lead to the restoration of tranquillity.

The Flacian preachers attacked the Duke on account of his toleration of the avowed heresy of Strigel and Hugel, and they drew attention in the pulpit to ‘ all sorts of erroneous doctrines which they wished to see condemned.’

‘ Flacius and his colleagues,’ wrote, later on, the professors at Jena, ‘ preached of nothing else than Synergists, Adiaphorists, Schwenckfeldians, Majorites, Antinomians, Philipists, Calvinists, and other such peculiar sects whose doctrines they anathematised. Meanwhile the common people, hearing nothing but this extraordinary new kind of sermonising, forgot all about their catechism ; and, moreover, caring nothing and understanding less about these strange sects, they gradually

¹ Despatch of Theophilus Dasypodius, November 9, 1561, in Ritter, *Flacius Illyricus*, pp. 130-133.

² An edict against Flacius was issued at Nuremberg on May 5, 1564, to the effect that if he slipped into the town again, ‘ he was to be arrested and secretly shut up for a time, so that people might not know what had become of him....’ The magistrate described him and his ‘ rabble ’ as criminals, scoundrels, and so forth (Strobel, *Beiträge*, i. 406-412).

left off coming to church, so that God's houses have come to be empty and deserted, His Word is set at nought and despised, sermons looked on as nothing more than fictitious tales or news of the day, and discussed as such, with laughter and ridicule, over the beer pot and the wine bottle ; and the result of all this has been so much scandal, discontent, and sedition that the magistrates have enough to do to keep the peace.'

All the learned branches of study, which had already fallen into considerable disrepute, were brought into utter contempt by the Flacians. Musäus, in a public and solemn disputation, had called the university of Wittenberg a stinking cesspool of the devil. A superintendent had exclaimed from the pulpit : 'Dear mother, if you were to stab through the heart the child you have carried in your bosom, you would not be guilty of so great a crime as if you were to send him to Wittenberg or to any other university.' Another man had preached that it was better to send one's children to a house of ill-fame than to a university.¹

In the Saxon electorate matters were just as bad as in the Duchy. Quarrelling, discontent, frightful corruption, and depravity prevailed everywhere among the people.

'Our evangelical Church,' wrote the Wittenberg professor, Paul Eber, in 1560, 'is so marred and disfigured throughout with terrible rents and blemishes, that its appearance altogether belies its vaunted character. If you look at the evangelical teachers you will see that some of them, either from ambition, or jealousy, or presumption, crush out and destroy the true doctrine and propagate and protect false teaching ; others twist

¹ Heppe, *Gesch. des Protestantismus*, i. 75 ; Arnold, i. 950.

and bend religion to suit their own tastes or the requirements of their overlords or of the people ; while yet others, who have really preached the truth, counteract all their teaching by the frivolity and profligacy of their lives. If you turn to the evangelical congregations, you will see lamentable abuse of religion and of Christian liberty ; you will see contempt and want of veneration for Church worship, disgraceful contention, shameless squandering of Church goods, ingratitude towards the faithful ministers of the Word, decay of all morality, unbounded insubordination among the young, and a most abundant daily growth of every imaginable vice.' A few years later he said, in a public speech : ' Nothing causes so much anxiety to virtue-loving men as the general wantonness of conduct and contempt for all discipline, the insolent, blustering rowdyism, and the dishonest, pilfering ways which are so common nowadays even with young lads.'¹ Insubordination among the Wittenberg students had reached such a pitch that a general collapse and a reversion to utter barbarism were apprehended in the year 1562.²

' Of reverence for the aged,' wrote Paul Eber's colleague, Professor George Major, ' there is no trace left among the young ; they treat them with the uttermost contempt. The world is at its last gasp ; the day of judgment cannot be far off ; all the energies of the Church and of society are dormant. In consequence of the interminable dissensions between theologians and preachers, the populace no longer knows on which side

¹ Döllinger, ii. 160-162.

² Arnold, i. 715-716. Respecting the decline of morality at Wittenberg and other universities, see J. Janssen, *Aus dem Universitätsleben des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Frankfurt a. M. und Luzern, 1886, und Janssen-Pastor, *Gesch. des deutschen Volkes*, Bd. 7 (1-12 Aufl.), 185 ff.

the real truth lies. The papists cast in our teeth the iniquity of separation from the Church. I know well how great this sin is, and that we cannot sufficiently grieve over it. But I know also that simple souls are so sorely perplexed and bewildered that they are in doubt as to where truth is to be found, and whether there is still a Church of God in existence which can be distinguished from the unbelieving multitudes around them.'¹ Another Wittenberg professor, Matthew Bloc'hinger, writes the following wail: ‘Nowadays we hear voices in all directions praising up the enemy’—*i.e.* the Catholics—‘and justifying these eulogies on the ground that, owing to the want of unity among our preachers, it is impossible to know what it is right to believe. This tendency is augmented by the cries of agitators bent on stirring up insurrection. The papists, at any rate, it is said, agree among themselves, and so do even the Turks. We Protestant Christians, on the contrary, are at ceaseless war together, fighting one another with frenzied, implacable hatred, while every breath of new opinion scatters us about like a whirlwind.’²

At Bremen the cathedral preacher, Albert Hardenberg, had lain for years under suspicion of Calvinism because he had refused to sign the Confession of Augsburg and the Apology. He had declared that he could only pledge himself to belief in the Bible, and that the Augsburg Confession, to meet the exigencies of the time, had been framed in such a manner as to gain over the Emperor and the Pope, or, at any rate, to embitter them as little as possible. The article on the Holy Communion in this Confession contained, he said,

¹ Eber, p. 51^a.

² Döllinger, ii. 171–172.

popish doctrine, and in the Apology even worse concessions had been made to the Catholics. In the edition handed him for signature, it was true the text of the articles was not the same as the first edition ; they had been altered and abridged ; but he doubted whether anybody had the right to alter and shorten a document that had been drawn up for and handed in to the Emperor and the Empire. Hardenberg and those like-minded were of opinion that the ‘abomination of popish idolatry’ would never be rooted out so long as the Lutheran doctrine of the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament was taught and believed.¹ ‘Fierce party divisions’ arose in the town on this point. ‘So fierce was the tumult of controversy that the closest bonds of friendship and relationship went for nothing among the partisans of different opinions.’ ‘In barbers’ shops, in clubs and taverns, nothing was talked of but the new doctrine of the Communion. Such blasphemous utterances were heard as “People have been eating the Body of Christ for so long ; can there be any of it left ?” Is the bread-God of the pastors eaten with boots and breeches?’² Hardenberg’s opponents actually accused him of having said that ‘Christ was so overcome with the terror of death, at the time when He instituted the Holy Communion, that He did not know what He was saying.’³ Tilmann Hesshus, who had been banished from Heidelberg, was appointed superintendent by the strong Lutheran

¹ *Warhafte Widerlegung*, p. 7.

² See Wilkens, pp. 75–81. Concerning the Hardenberg disturbances at Bremen in 1547–1556, see *Brem- und Verdische Bibl.* iii. 683–812. See also Heidenhain, *Unionspolitik Philipp’s von Hessen*, pp. 162 f., and the publication of Rottländer referred to at p. 181, note 1.

³ Backmeister, *Christliche Anleitung*, p. 118.

party in the Council, and he made it his special business ‘to get rid of the satanic villain, Hardenberg, and his gang of associates.’ He said, in 1561, ‘it was a wonder that the magistrate could sit still when the cathedral “*paffen*” at Bremen had established a murderer’s pit in which they daily strangled some of the burghers, or committed assaults on burghers’ wives and daughters. The cathedral of Bremen likewise has become a spiritual den of murderers, in which spiritual whoredom is committed, and where thousands of souls are murdered, and the most dangerous venom of false doctrine thrown among our citizens. The Bremen magistrate is bound before God to drive out these accursed villains from the cathedral.’¹ In every sermon he preached, Hesshus poured out volleys of most virulent abuse against Hardenberg, and relegated all his associates to the devil, to whom, he said, their leader belonged. Hardenberg complained that he was no longer safe in his own house, and he used to take refuge with kind friends, because every night he expected violent attacks on his person ; so fierce was Hesshus’s persecution of him and his endeavours, in conjunction with other preachers, to incense the Council against him.² Christian III. of Denmark, called by the strict Lutherans ‘the most holy king,’ would have preferred the cathedral of Bremen being turned into a heap of stones rather than that false doctrine concerning the Sacrament should be preached in it : he insisted that the town council must turn out the heretic like Baal Peor.³

The Estates of the Nether Saxon circle decided, by

¹ Heppe, *Gesch. des Protestantismus*, i. 471–472.

² *Corp. Reform.* ix. 1080, note 2. See Döllinger, ii. 462.

³ Wilkens, p. 77.

an overwhelming majority, that Hardenberg must be banished, or otherwise there would be ‘the same sort of business at Bremen as there had been at Münster at the time of the Anabaptists.’¹

Hardenberg was expelled in the year 1561, and he took refuge at Emden. Hesshus also left Bremen; but the disturbances in the town gathered strength after his departure, as his successor in the office of superintendent, Simon Musäus, who had been banished from Jena, ‘carried on still more devilish proceedings against his adversaries.’ This preacher declared, in a course of four sermons on the Sacrament, that ‘he would not lay his head on a pillow until the poor town of Bremen, which the godless crew of Sacramentarians had turned into a new Sodom and Gomorrha, had been re-cleansed and purified, even were it with fire and salt. It was the duty of the town council,’ he said, ‘to use its sword against them.’²

In a new code of Church ordinances which he drew up, Musäus claimed for himself and the whole company of preachers the right of pronouncing the ban over all heretics and wicked persons among the inhabitants. When the Council, at the suggestion of the burgomaster, Daniel von Bürgen, represented to the preachers that even Luther had not used such stern discipline, although there was plenty of crime and misdemeanour at Wittenberg, the answer given was that Musäus could declare from his own personal knowledge that Luther, from the pulpit, had excommunicated and delivered over to the devil, by name, the governor of the town and a barber, for the sin of profligacy, the poet Lemnius for writing

¹ ‘Die Verhandlungen bei Löscher,’ *Hist. motuum*, ii. 245 f.

² Walte, *Mittheilungen*, i. 60.

scurrilous verses, and even Duke George of Saxony and the Archbishop of Mayence. If danger, alarm, and tumult resulted from pronouncing the ban, or if quarrels arose between friends and relations in consequence, no attention must be paid to such trifles, if only souls could be rescued from the jaws of the devil.

The town council, the majority of whose members were on the side of the preachers, now enforced anew, against the followers of Hardenberg, an edict which had been issued formerly against the Anabaptists. Thereupon Daniel von Büren, one of the number, collected all his fellow-believers in the cathedral on January 19, 1562, and a tumult ensued. ‘Mylord Omnes, armed with hatchets and muskets,’ threatened the town councillors, who had been called together, ‘that if they did not agree to Büren’s proposals they should be hewn in pieces and thrown out of the window.’ The terrified councillors yielded to Büren’s demand that Musäus, and one of his most zealous assistants, should be expelled from the town, and that the other preachers should be bound over not to preach any more against Hardenberg’s doctrines. In future, they stipulated, religious questions should not be settled without the assent of the whole community. The banished preachers were ‘followed into voluntary exile by twelve others;’ numbers of the laity also, among whom were many of the town councillors, left the town and sought help among the Nether Saxon Estates against ‘the heretical city of their birth.’

Hamburg and Lübeck broke off all mercantile relations with their confederate city; Dantzig laid an embargo on all Bremen ships, goods, and orders; several Nether Saxon and Westphalian lords, notably

the Counts of Oldenburg, Hoya, and East Friesland, forbade the burghers of Bremen to set foot on their territory. Bremen, it was said, had now become a new Münster. Daniel von Büren was another John of Leyden. The battle over the Sacrament came nigh to being fought with worldly weapons. It was not till 1568 that a reconciliation was effected, and even then ‘the acrimony and all the scurrilous wrangling did not die out, and trade and industry suffered indescribably.’

Calvinism gained the upper hand in Bremen.¹

Tilmann Hesshus had moved from Bremen to Magdeburg, where he became superintendent and conceived the idea of ‘converting the town, which, since the time of the idolatrous interim, had been widely famed as the veritable chancellery of the Almighty, into the new Jerusalem of Germany, and determined utterly to extirpate all heretics who dared befoul the true Lutheran doctrine, together with the last remnants of the accursed papists.’

In his campaign against the Catholics he met with powerful support.

In the Magdeburg Church ordinances it had been declared that ‘the stiff-necked papists were not Christians, but sheer idolaters, and that they must not be buried in the churchyard where the Christians slept, so that there might be no mingling of the bones of Christians with those of open apostates and inveterate enemies of Christ.’ This refusal of Christian burial applied especially to ‘Baalitish priests, monks, and nuns,’ and to the

¹ See Löscher, ii. 258 ff. Häberlin, vi. 351 ff.; the catalogue of the different party publications, p. 390, note. Walte, pp. 62 f. See Rottländer, *Daniel von Büren und die Hardenbergischen Religionshändel in Bremen, 1555–1562*; Göttingen, 1893.

whole ‘gang of ecclesiastics.’ Parents and guardians also, who did not prevent their belongings from receiving consecration, or accepting prelacies and benefices from the Roman Antichrist, must be excluded from the Sacrament, the privilege of sponsorship, and the rites of interment ; for it had been said : ‘ Be ye not yoked together with unbelievers ; God wills not that we should worship the devil.’¹

In the year 1557, however, a compact had been signed between the town and the Catholic clergy at Wolmirstedt, according to which the chapter and the clergy of the collegiate church were for ever to retain possession of their goods and treasures, and ‘to be allowed to continue, unhindered, in the exercise of their ancient Catholic religion, church worship, rites and usages.’ This agreement had been brought about mainly by the efforts of Pfeil, the former syndicus of Hamburg, who, although a zealous Protestant, wished the Catholics to enjoy a certain amount of tolerance, and thought the town’s only chance of salvation lay in the friendly existence of the different creeds side by side. But Heshus hotly opposed it, and called Pfeil an accomplished hypocrite, who had done more harm to Magdeburg than a hundred sieges : ‘this idolatrous, papistical religion of the canons had no right to be called “the ancient religion.”’ When Pfeil appealed to imperial decrees in his own defence, Heshus answered : ‘If emperors, kings, electors, and notables honour this religion with such a designation, in so doing they deny God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.’²

Heshus met with loyal help against ‘the Baalitish,

¹ Richter, *Evangel. Kirchenordnungen*, ii. 148–149.

² Wilkens, pp. 102–103.

popish idolatry and its practices' from the professors Matthew Judex and John Wigand, whom he had befriended as the 'exiles of Christ' in order to gain their co-operation in 'kindling the godly fire' among the burghers. Both these men in the last few years had issued publications in which they 'had sounded a mighty trumpet against the Antichrist,' and in their sermons they had consigned to the devil, by divine authority, all persons who associated with papists, even in mundane matters, such as eating, drinking, buying and selling, or greeting in the highways.¹

But 'the fire of godly wrath' was not to fall on the papists only, but also on those princes who had 'framed highly pernicious articles' at Naumburg.

The convention held at Lüneburg in opposition to the Naumburg Resolutions had set up a new obligatory confession of faith and fresh anathemas, and Hesshus laid the decrees before his clergy for their signatures. Schoolmasters also were expected to sign them. Many refused to sign and were taken under the protection of the town council, whereupon Hesshus announced that he would deal out punishment in spite of Periculists, Neutralists, and weathercocks, even if the godless jurists should burst of wickedness. 'Let who will rage and bluster, Doctor Hesshusius cares no whit; if I have to do with unmerciful jurists, I still have a merciful God.' The bitterness of feeling increased because the

¹ *Wie wir Christen dem antichristlichen Baal und römischen Abgott christlich widerstehen sollen* (1562), pp. 5, 6. Wigand's pamphlet bears the title: '*Synopsis Antichristi Romani, spiritu oris Christi revelati*', Jena, 1560. That of Judex is called '*Gravissimum et severissimum Edictum et Mandatum æterni et omnipotentis Dei, quomodo quisque Christianus . . . sese adversus Papatum nimirum Antichristum . . . gerere et exhibere debeat*' [1561]. Schlüsselburg, xiii. 256 ff., 313. We shall come back again to this last pamphlet.

Council would not allow that ‘the exiles of Christ,’ Wigand and Judex, ‘were saints who ought to be welcomed as gifts of God,’ and also because it forbade Wigand’s being appointed pastor of the parish of Ulrich. A follower of Hesshus adjured the elders of the Church, in a public letter, not to let themselves be deterred by any devil’s arrows (*Teufels-pfeile*, a pun on Pfeil’s name); the councillors, he said, were blasphemers of the Holy Trinity, and ravishers of all the heavenly treasures. Hesshus allowed that this letter was certainly strong and pitiless, like a thick rod cut from hard, gnarled branches, and shaped with a sledge-hammer on hard rock; but Isaiah, Hosea, and Moses had been ten times harder and more relentless in their denunciations; the thicker the rod, the better for the child. From the pulpit he exclaimed that for the last forty years so great a crime had not been committed in Magdeburg as that of the town council’s in ordering the arrest of the secret canvassers for Wigand.¹ The preachers abused and damned each other; a dangerous fermentation spread among the people. At a cantonal diet at Lüneburg of the Estates of the circle, the Nether Saxon notables declared that ‘disturbance and insurrection among the populace, the decay of religion and of schools, the collapse of all police rule and discipline, must inevitably ensue if some means were not found of putting a stop to the party hatred which the theological dissensions brought into every department of life. On pain of banishment and corporal punishment they inhibited all slander and invective from pulpits and chairs; and as no one was safe from scurrilous libels and indecent caricatures, they decreed that nothing should be pub-

¹ Wilkens, pp. 105-106, 114-116.

lished without permission from the municipal authorities.

The Council of Magdeburg sent Hesshus this mandate of the Estates of the circle, and with it a copy of the order issued at Halle by the Protestant Archbishop Sigmund, that the mandate was to be strictly obeyed. This, however, was far from the intention of Hesshus. The mandate, he said, had been drawn up ‘without consulting the mouthpiece of the Lord : the princes were drunk when they went to the Council board, and the jurists were full of wine when they had vomited out this mandate, which they expected people to conform to.’ He did not scruple to declare from the pulpit that the mandate had been composed by godless jurists and written out by drunken ones ; the order emanating from Halle was, he said, ‘a hellish, devilish, impious, and blasphemous piece of work.’ He and his associates went about warning believers against the preachers who were on the side of the town council as against murderers of souls, perjurors, traitors, tyrants, and enemies of Christ. These preachers in return were not chary of ‘their maledictions on Hesshus and his followers.’

While the Council was holding debate concerning the suspension of the pastors, the Hesshusians had a vision : they ‘saw in the sky four bright luminous pillars, which were awful to behold, and which stood still for several hours ; soon after, the heavens burst over the town with such terrific fire that those who saw it fell into swoons ; a shoemaker was thrown into fearful terror which lasted for seven hours, and he moaned out that five conflagrations betokened the wrath of God.’ The mutual vituperations of the preachers caused such distressing doubt among the listeners that many of

them became quite ill, and many were driven to madness.

On October 1, 1562, the Council issued orders to Heshus that he was not to preach any more ; and on the following Sunday his chaplain, Bartholomew Strele, mounted the pulpit and pronounced the sentence of major excommunication over two pastors, three chaplains, and the whole Council. ‘I cut them off,’ he said, ‘as stinking, corrupt members, from the community of Christ ; I close the door of heaven against them, and throw wide open the gates of hell, and I consign them to the devil himself, to be plagued and tormented for ever and ever.’ He told the populace that henceforth they must look upon the members of the Council, the excommunicated clergy and all their adherents as ‘heathen unchristian men.’ One of these anathematised clerics, Otto Oemes, pastor of St. James’s, who was present at this sermon, called out loud : ‘ You lie, you lie, you scoundrel and villain,’ and then, if he had not been held back by some of the congregation, he would have made for the pulpit with a knife, collared the chaplain, and thrown him down from the pulpit. There was a great uproar in the church, and Strele was obliged to stop preaching. It was believed that Heshus had instigated him to this proceeding. ‘ If God Almighty,’ the Council wrote, ‘ had not turned the tide, the plan of the instigator would have been carried out, and the ban enforced with hatchets and broad axes ; for these instruments were all ready to hand.’ On being ordered by the Council to leave the parish, Heshus answered : ‘ I no longer recognise your authority ; you and your lying preachers are under sentence of excommunication, and you belong to the devil, where you stand and where

you walk.' At last, during the night of October 21, the Council called out the burghers to arms ; the parsonage was besieged, and Hesshus led out of the town by force. All the preachers of his party shared his fate.¹

Nevertheless, the riots and dissensions lasted on. ' In numbers of houses matches were found, laid with incendiary intent, and, in some, fire broke out.' The preachers who were on the side of the Council ' would not allow those persons who defended Hesshus, or who expressed disapproval of the proceedings against him, to receive the Sacrament ; and these friends of Hesshus, on their part, would not confess to those preachers or go to their churches, because in all their sermons they inveighed against the late superintendent, and they compelled penitents in the confessional to repudiate Hesshus ; for which reason many people did not go to church or to confession for a long time, and consequently were not safe in the town.'² Hesshus sent letters to his followers enjoining them to abstain from receiving the Sacrament from the ' false brethren,' and telling them that if they should require the services of the latter on their death-beds, they must first insist on their recording their belief that a wrong had been done to Hesshus and his associates ; if then the Sacrament was refused them, it would be better for them to die

¹ Wilkens, pp. 116-120. Letters in Döllinger, ii. 463-465 ; Arnold, i. 744-748 ; Salig, iii. 918-939. To Flacius Hesshus wrote : ' Venit hora ruinæ ecclesiæ Magdeburgensis ac profecto cum ingenti fragore, qui per universam Europam exaudietur, est collapsa' (*Unschuldige Nachrichten auf 1711*, pp. 798-99).

² Leuckfeld, *Hist. Hesshusiana*, p. 35, appeals in confirmation of these statements to a number of original letters and autograph *Reverses* (written bonds), which some of the preachers put before their penitents at confession.

without receiving it, because God, in case of necessity, could save true believers without the help of the Sacrament.¹ Shoals of libellous and controversial pamphlets passed between the different parties and inflamed their tempers.² Nicholas of Amsdorf, the former Protestant Bishop of Naumburg, wrote an ‘Admonition’ on behalf of the Council, in which he called Hesshus a pig-headed creature and a ranter, and denounced the rest of the preachers as insurgents, and called Strele’s sentence of excommunication ‘a diabolical piece of wickedness.’ Hesshus, in his answer, reproached Amsdorf with having been bribed by a sum of gold to write this letter. Amsdorf, however, repudiated the charge, saying that he had never had the good fortune to receive a present from any one.³

In 1568 matters were still unsettled, for we find the nobleman Andreas von Meyendorf writing to the theologian Martin Chemnitz, whom the town council wanted to call in to appease the disturbances, that for the last six years in Magdeburg there had been nothing but blasphemous denunciation of the expelled preachers, and of all pure doctrine, and that numbers of pious, innocent Christians had been pilloried, laid in fetters, tortured, and expelled, and driven into utter misery. It was a case in which there could be no hope of mediation or reconciliation, such as might be effected if one were dealing with less determined people, or with people who recognised their sinfulness, but ‘here there is nothing but audacious persistence in sin, endless persecution, and defamation of the injured parties.’⁴

¹ Salig, iii. 941–944.

² A catalogue of their publications is given in Leuckfeld, pp. 34–36.

³ Salig, iii. 944–947.

⁴ Leuckfeld, pp. 37–43.

The prediction of the Nether Saxon Estates at Lüneburg in 1561, that ‘the ruin of religion and of the schools, and the decay of all police control and discipline must inevitably result from the religious dissensions and anarchy,’ were fully verified, not only with regard to Magdeburg; but to the whole diocese, during a general visitation of churches instituted in the years 1562–1564 by the Protestant Archbishop Sigmund.

Wherever they went, the visiting inspectors found the grossest depravity. Among many other laments over the crass ignorance of the preachers, we quote the following: ‘Andreas Müller, pastor of Bückaw, was ordained at Wittenberg, and came out very badly in the examination. He has had no grounding in Christian doctrine ; he has no understanding of its leading points, or at any rate very little.’ ‘The pastor of Brumby gave the following answer to the questions on the Trinity : “God the Holy Ghost was created by the Father ; God the Father, and the Mother of God, is the first Person in the Godhead; item, the Son is the middle Person, as Calbe is the middle town between Halle and Wolmirstedt.”’ ‘Mauritius Dalchaw, pastor at Kulhusen was ordained at Berlin ; he produced his testimonials ; was nominated by the parish where he has ministered during eleven years ; he is a thoroughly unlearned man, who knows of no distinction between the Persons of the Trinity, in short a German gentleman, who does not know a word of Latin.’ ‘Bernard Geller, pastor of Gudensweg, was ordained at Brunswick ; made very poor answers to the questions put to him on Christian doctrine ; was first a glazier, and then a sacristan, before he became pastor.’ ‘Antonius Meyerin, pastor of Zeppernick, was ordained at

Magdeburg : has never studied, knows no Latin, was formerly a fustian weaver.' 'Ciriacus Moller, pastor at Schwarz, was ordained at Wittenberg, as testified by a sealed certificate from the theologians at Wittenberg ; could answer very little on the articles he was examined in, especially about God ; was formerly servant at a tavern at Calbe, and married a woman of bad character there. His wife is a wicked, mischievous person, who causes all sorts of discord and mutiny in the place.' 'Ernest Kütze, pastor of Ebendorf, was ordained at Stendal, is well educated, but has been under penal sentence for murder and other assaults, and also for drunkenness. It is necessary to keep strict watch over him.'¹

The inspectors found also that the nobility, the towns, and the villages exercised arbitrary power in all ecclesiastical matters. Magistrates, gentry, and congregations were in the habit of possessing themselves of the church goods, and refusing to pay the pastors and sacristans their salaries.² The pastor of Aken complained of complete neglect of church attendance in his parish, of blasphemy and ridicule of the Eucharist, of whoredom with the devil, of sacrilegious cursing, and of immorality and laxity in the matter of marriage : it had become common for couples to engage themselves, to have their banns published in church, and then without further ceremony to refuse to contract the marriage. In the town of Schönebeck, 'where there were about 200 householders, the parishioners,' so it is said, 'are for the most part a rude, uncivilised lot, who concern themselves very little about God.' In the town of

¹ Danneil, II. 1, 8, 52, 70 ; III. 3, 24, 34-36, 68.

² *Ibid.* I., VI. 2, 38 ; 3, 17, 24.

Jerichow, ‘during the last eighteen months, only two men had been to the Sacrament.’ The inhabitants of Frohse were described by the magistrates as ‘disreputable, good-for-nothing scoundrels,’ over whom ‘they had no control.’ In Hohendodelene, ‘a village of sixty-five householders, there are scarcely ten who know how to pray, and as for the Sacraments, the whole population knows little or nothing about them.’ ‘In the whole district of Sandau, contrary to all expectations, was found a large number of peasants who could not say any prayers ; most of them could not repeat the Ten Commandments, nor give any account of baptism and the Sacrament.’ In the villages of Cörbelitz and Wolterstorf ‘there were not more than three people who could say the Lord’s Prayer ; of the other parts of the Catechism they knew nothing ; they are a reckless set of people, who move one’s pity.’ In more than twenty other districts the inspectors found everything ‘lawless and godless.’ Respecting Aldenhausen, they report : ‘The peasants’ condition with regard to prayer is such as to make one think that Christianity has come to an end at Aldenhausen.’¹

Among the theologians and preachers in the Mark of Brandenburg there were strict Lutherans, Flacians, Melanchthonians, Majorites, Osianderites, partisans and opponents of the Frankfort Recess and the Naumburg Resolutions. Each party sought to gain the favour of the Elector Joachim II., and to crush its antagonists by secular force. In the Mark also, as elsewhere, the theological dissensions were paraded before the people from the pulpit, and the congregations of the different

¹ Danneil, I. 26, 28, 29, 35–36 ; II. 17, 21, 30, 47, 54, 77, 78, 83, 84, 94, 96, 109, 112, 113, 139 : III. 9, 10, 16, 22, 25, 27 u. s. w.

sects incensed against the opposite parties. The Court-preacher Agricola, who, since the time of the interim, had gone back again to strict Lutheranism, called his former friend Melanchthon ‘a child of Satan,’ and after the latter’s death declared from the pulpit that ‘If Philip did not recant before his death, and end his days with very different opinions from those which he had written and taught, he is now eternally damned, and his body and soul are for ever with the devil.’¹

The university of Frankfort on the Oder became a hotbed ‘of profligacy and of theological dissensions.’

The preacher and theological professor of this university, Andrew Musculus, combated with all his might the Lutheran doctrine of ‘stoical necessity’—that is to say, of the bondage of the will—and inveighed especially against the dogma of ‘new obedience’ laid down in the Frankfort Recess in 1558. ‘They are all of the devil,’ he said, ‘all those who preached that new obedience or good works were necessary to the Christian for salvation.’ ‘Those who teach that we must perform good works belong to the devil, and all who follow them follow the devil himself.’ Musculus quarrelled most violently with his colleague at the university, Abdias Prætorius, a Melanchthonian who advocated the necessity of ‘new obedience.’ Musculus denounced him from the pulpit as a perverter of youth, and, on being admonished by a deputation from the academical senate to be more moderate, he declared that he would allow no one to restrict him in his faith, and that those who brought forward other views than his concerning good works should be driven out of the town.

The Elector at first inclined more to the side of

¹ Kaweran, *Agricola*, pp. 318–321. See above, p. 57.

Prætorius, and ‘made use of his cleverness at court, in Church and civic affairs.’ In 1561 he issued a decree that Musculus was not to preach any more about good works, and that all writers of pasquinades and lampoons, in town and country, were to be seized and severely punished. All the same, Musculus went on raging against his adversary, and also made fierce attacks on the town magistrate in his sermons. He denounced the members of the town council as lewd fellows, despisers of God, and Sacramentarians.

In addition to the contention about good works, there was now also a schism on the question of the Holy Sacrament. Prætorius, backed up by the Council, stuck firmly to the opinion that the presence of the Body of Christ was limited to the mere moment of partaking. Musculus, on the other hand, would not agree to this limitation, and insisted on the adoration of the Body of the Redeemer present on the altar. He preached as follows : ‘ Whenever you hear people assert that we must not adore the Sacrament, you must say to them : “ Begone from my presence, you abominable, good-for-nothing devil ! ” Such people are no better than scoundrels, highway robbers, accursed revilers of Christ, fornicators, and drunkards.’ The Council informed the Elector, in 1562, that there was great agitation in the parish and that the worst was to be feared.

The university also reported that the quarrel had spread to the populace, and had made bad blood among them, so that uproar and sedition might be expected, and a collapse of the whole university might easily follow.¹ By far the greater number of the students hung by Prætorius, and treated Musculus ‘ like an

¹ Spieker’s *Musculus*, pp. 51 ff.

avowed criminal.' In the night of February 5, 1562, a large number of them drew up outside his house and summoned him to come out to be judged by them. They went through the farce of condemning to death, with terrible imprecations, a straw figure of a man ; they cut its head off, bound the limbs on a wheel, and threw them to a pack of dogs. On another occasion the students pelted their hated professor with stones as he was going into college. Twice they stormed his house. Joachim Belo, brother-in-law of Musculus, who had appointed him preacher, came to public blows with a deacon. On the occasion of installing a deacon, Musculus was obliged to resort to the protection of an escort of bailiffs armed with loaded muskets.¹

Meanwhile, Musculus had gained the full favour of the Elector.

Joachim warned the Council not to oppose the elevation of the host and the chalice,² which Musculus had ordered, and issued a warrant against Prætorius,³ who already, not sure of his life by reason of the Musculites,⁴ had fled to Wittenberg at the beginning of 1563. From this time forth the Elector looked upon him as a 'falsifier of the faith.' When he heard that George Buchholzer, Provost at Berlin, approved of Prætorius's doctrine of the 'new obedience,' he made of him 'a public warning example,' although only a short time before he had taken him under his protection against Agricola, by whom he had been publicly excommunicated on account of a quarrel over the doctrine of justification. On April 19, 1563, Joachim assembled

¹ Spieker, pp. 70, 86, 89, 98.

² *Ibid.* pp. 75 f.

³ Döllinger, *Reformation*, ii. 397, note 8.

⁴ Prætorius, *Endlicher Bericht von seiner Lehre* (1563), viii. 190, 383.

all the officials and preachers of the capital in order to read his will and testament to them. ‘I have often listened to your preaching,’ he said to the clergymen, ‘and now I am going to preach to you for once.’ He explained every point in his will, and finally declared that he held the doctrine of Musculus to be the only true one, and herewith gave it his public approbation. ‘He then raised a stick against Buchholzer as if intending to strike him,’ and reproached him in the sternest manner with having allowed himself to be misled by Prætorius. If Luther, he said, were to rise from the grave he would strike him and all his followers dead with clubs. ‘Herr Georg,’ he said at the end of his speech, ‘I intend to stand by the teaching of Musculus ; I commend my soul after death to our Lord God, but yours and your doctrine,’ that of Prætorius, ‘I commend to the devil.’ Buchholzer fell ill in consequence of this treatment, and died shortly after of a stroke of apoplexy.¹

¹ Geppert, *Chronik von Berlin*, i. 57 ; Müller und Küster, *Altes und neues Berlin*, i. 298 ; Spieker, *Musculus*, p. 96. Under a statement of the Provost’s, Joachim wrote : ‘Whosoever teaches this proposition : *bona opera sunt necessaria*, simply utters blasphemy and denies *doctrinam de Filio Dei, Paulum, Lutherum, et est incarnatus diabolus, Lucifer, Beelzebub*, and a perverter of the poor simple people, *et mancipium diaboli*, and must be with Judas in hell for evermore.’ Müller and Küster, *Altes und neues Berlin*, i. 299 f. Spieker, *Beschreibung der Marienkirche zu Frankfurt an der Oder*, p. 185. The manner in which controversy was carried on at that time is seen from a letter of Buchholzer’s to Prætorius, of January 25, 1562: ‘Yesterday, while I was sitting in Dr. Schlegel’s house, there came in the devil’s herald, Vitus Bach,’ private lecturer at Frankfort on the Oder. ‘On seeing him I said, “There comes the councillor of Musculus, the Black King, who asserts *quod Christus mortuus est secundum utramque naturam, et quod bona opera non sunt necessaria.*” Then he said, “I am a disciple of the holy Musculus.” I asked whether also “*oratio esset necessaria.*” He sat silent a long time and then said, “No.” Then I said, “But Christ says, “*Orate, ne intretis in temptationem. Orate est imperativus et habet in*

The academical senate of Frankfort sent an embassy to the Elector and to the provincial Estates assembled in Berlin, to inform them that, owing to the theological feuds, the university was on the point of ruin, that the students were leaving it in swarms, that Musculus did nothing but slander and revile all the other professors, and that the return of the universally beloved Prætorius was urgently wished for. The provincial Estates answered that, although they were unlearned men, they were nevertheless convinced that Prætorius was in the right, and they would therefore not concede anything to the Elector until he had recalled the banished man to Frankfort.

The Elector, on the other hand, ‘gave the ambassadors such an ungracious hearing that they were quite frightened.’ ‘Sooner than suffer Musculus and his doctrine to be put to shame,’ he said, ‘he would rather that the whole university went to the devil, or were set on fire and burnt to cinders: he had once for all given his public sanction to the teaching of Musculus, and he intended to stand by Musculus, even if they all, with the university, should go to the devil.’¹

se necessitatem faciendi.” Then he said, “Christ spoke those words *tanquam legislator*; they do not concern us.” Then there was a great burst of laughter. Then I said, “You lie like a damned scoundrel with Meusel and Eisleben.” Afterwards, whenever I raised any question *de Christi mandato*, he said they were *verba legislatoris*; there was no need for us to attend to them. Then I asked him whether among the *verba necessitatis* were also *beati pauperes, beati mites*, &c. Those were not *præcepta*, but *exhortationes*, he said. Then I proved to him the *contrarium ex propositionibus Lutheri*, and so forth. Then he was beaten down to the ground and went away. Then I said, “There goes the child of the devil, the glutton, the child of the mad ape! *Ita discessit cum magna ignominia. Ideo esto bono animo, nos convincemus illos nebulones*; they are cowardly villains, *incepti ad disputandum, indocti*” (in Spieker’s *Musculus*, p. 67).

¹ Spieker, pp. 99–100.

Musculus went on persistently ‘pouring oil on the fire.’ The members of the Council complained to the Elector, in December 1565, that he called them ‘devilish scoundrels and villains’ from the pulpit, and that he talked most blasphemously about the Sacrament, saying, for instance: ‘You will not believe till you have got it in your jaws or your throat; you won’t be satisfied unless I show you Christ in a blue coat as He sat with the disciples at the supper-table.’¹

‘The Sacrament of Love’ continued to be the worst apple of discord in the whole land: it was disputed about in beer-houses and at banquets, and bloody frays often arose on the questions how long Christ remained present, if His Body and Blood were digested and excreted, if His Blood could be spilled, run into one’s beard, and so forth.² On one occasion when John Musculus, who had been appointed by his father Andreas to be pastor of the suburb of Lebus, spilt the contents of the chalice at the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, the Elector convened a synod at Berlin and said at the opening of it that it was not enough to take the offender prisoner and to expel him from the country, but that, as he had spilt the Blood of the Lord, his own blood must not be spared, and two or three of his fingers must be chopped off.³

The ‘frightful and general demoralisation of the people,’ which the religious dissensions had caused, no less in the Mark Brandenburg than everywhere else, was looked upon by Musculus as a confirmation of his belief that ‘we have degenerated into the image

¹ Spieker, p. 124.

² See O. Kramer, *Vom Nachtmahl des Herrn, &c.* (Frankfort, 1569), s. 5, 9.

³ Heppe, *Gesch. des Protestantismus*, ii. 386–387.

of the devil ; those persons especially are of the devil who assert that there is still any good left in man.' He used at the same time to utter the most outrageous invectives against the Pope, and he incited the young folk in the streets to scream out abuse of his Holiness. But he was forced all the same to recognise that, under the Papacy, the people had been more pious, well-behaved, and moral than in his time. 'If our grandparents,' he wrote, 'could see the world as it is now, especially the youthful portion of it, they would shut their eyes in horror or spit on us, because in such a highly-favoured age' (that of the new Gospel) 'we ourselves are more wicked than the devil. Sodom and Gomorrha, the Venusberg itself, are as child's play to the depravity we see all around us in the present day.' 'Everywhere resounds the same cry and lamentation, that the young have never been so perverted and so bad since the beginning of the world as they are now, and that they could not well be worse.' The terrible sin of the evangelicals, both young and old, was the 'habit of blasphemy,' never heard of formerly, which, not without a special judgment of God, had come into vogue with the new Gospel during the last forty years. With this crime all other vices are bound up. 'We are all of us compelled to acknowledge that, although in other countries also, sin and wickedness have everywhere risen to the highest pitch, the most good-for-nothing scoundrels have nevertheless been found among the people who made their boast of the holy Gospel and the Word of God ; it is among these that we have seen greatest contempt for God, for morality, and for honour.'

Musculus pointed out that their Catholic ancestors

‘had given diligent heed to the things of a future life, had gone about seeking help and counsel in order to avoid future punishment, and had done all in their power by chastising their bodies, fasting, praying, almsgiving, founding religious institutions, and so forth ;’ now, however, nobody cared either about heaven or hell, nobody gave a thought either to God or to the devil. ‘The day of judgment is near,’ ‘we must resume the customs of the ancient Church and pray to God with incessant supplications that He would put an end to, or lessen our tribulation,’ both now and hereafter. ‘But prayer and church-going are out of fashion.’ ‘Our noblemen are altogether epicurean and swinish ; our burghers do not care who preaches, administers the Sacraments, confesses and does penance ; they think only of eating and drinking, and of fleecing, flaying, cheating and over-reaching their neighbours ; the peasants have completely forgotten their old religion, and the beer-bottle has become dearer to them than the church ; if God has patience with Germany but a short while longer, we shall soon see more pillars in the churches than men and women. If there are any pious Christians left, who still do something for the Church, they are not visible to mortal eyes. Churches, schools, hospitals, are destroyed, plundered, ravaged ; the young are lamentably neglected ; the paths to study are closed to the children of the needy, and the claims of poverty are altogether forgotten.’

Such were the complaints made by Musculus as superintendent of the Mark.

In the Duchy of Prussia the general condition of things was equally anarchical, and Duke Albert could

only look on helplessly at the religious dissensions which were scattering ruin broadcast through the land. He received but scant consolation from the letters of friends telling him how bad things were in all directions. ‘Germany,’ wrote to him Melanchthon’s son-in-law, Caspar Peucer, on May 6, 1561, ‘is so rent and distracted by its internal dissensions, which increase from day to day, that I fear both ecclesiastical and political order will altogether succumb. How by mere human means to put a stop to these disputes, which breed and multiply in perpetuity, each giving rise to some other vexed question, I am at a loss to see.’¹

Fresh matter for strife was stirred up in Prussia by Albert’s court preacher Funk, who, after Osiander’s death, ‘for many years played the leading part in the land.’ ‘He was a shrewd and crafty man, who resorted to all sorts of artifices for deluding the Duke, and was known to everybody as a great drinker, just as his instructor and misleader Osiander had been, who, when in a state of intoxication, would use most improper language concerning the holiest things.’²

It happened in the year 1561 that an adventurer, one Paul Scalichius, ‘the pretended Margrave of Verona,’ came to the court by invitation of the Duke, and struck up a close intimacy with Funk. In spite of the opposition of the theological faculty he was allowed to give lectures on theology at Königsberg. He put forward

¹ Voigt, *Briefwechsel*, p. 507.

² See Funk’s *Bekenntnisse vom Trunk* (Confessions of Drinking), which ‘he could not renounce’ (drink) ‘without danger to his life’ (Hase, p. 175). Osiander fully rivalled Albert’s court retinue in strong drinking (Hartknoch, p. 354; Hase, p. 129). Justus Menius called Funk a ‘full beer-tap;’ he accused him of ‘daily drunkenness’ (Schmidt, *Justus Menius*, ii. 168).

'the strangest doctrines.' In one of his pamphlets he maintained, with a view to smoothing down the theological controversy on the Eucharist, that 'Christ had actually had three natures,' and he endeavoured to prove this with a large number of figures, circles, triangles, and squares. He made the Duke believe that he was in possession of a secret doctrine, and that he had received 'wonderful revelations' on many points, among others on the Trinity, on the origin of angels and of the devil, and on the power of the devil over men.

The Duke was very soon completely caught in the toils of this adventurer. He followed minutely all Scalich's directions, made use of magic incantations in the shape of prayers, and wore about his person a magic medal and ring to ward off the influence of evil spirits. Funk and Scalich played into each other's hands and enriched themselves at the expense of the country. Scalich received from the Duke 200 hides of land, besides farms and mills, and even the town and the district of Kreuzburg. The Estates complained that 'an unconscionable quantity of state raiment, landed property, pensions, carriages, corn, and amber had been wheedled out of the Duke by these people. Innumerable promissory notes also, which they had given to foreigners on the ducal estates, often for lifetime, had made such a drain on Albert's revenues that he had scarcely enough money left to pay for the bare necessities of existence. Quite extravagant sums, at an unusually high rate of interest, had disappeared in this manner.' On one occasion when Scalich borrowed 10,000 florins from the town of Königsberg in the Duke's name, he kept 7,000 for himself,

gave 2,000 to a donkey driver, and only 1,000 found their way into the Duke's coffers.¹ 'All over Prussia people were crying out against the new oppressive taxes and the depauperisation of the land.'

Scalich made off only in the nick of time. Funk was put in chains, and in the year 1566 condemned to death by a court of justice. The Duke had 'long ago repudiated the heretical Osianderite doctrines which he had patronised for so many years,' and Funk, as court preacher in 1563, had recanted from the pulpit all that he had formerly taught as a disciple of Osiander's. Nevertheless, in the petition of grievances sent up by the Estates, it was made a special reproach against him that 'for several years he had been a follower of the leading heretic Osiander, and had defended and propagated his heretical doctrines by means of violence, causing numbers of upright, pious, unoffending ministers of the Church to be deposed from their offices and expelled from the country.' Further, it was charged against Funk that he had counselled and helped on the introduction, by the Duke, without the knowledge of the Estates, of a fresh code of Church regulations, in which 'a new and highly repugnant service of baptism,' which omitted the ceremony of exorcism, had been foisted on the clergy. All who refused to accept this new code had been subjected to persecution, punished with imprisonment, or even banished from the land.

Albert's endeavours to save the life of his court preacher were unavailing. Funk and two members of

¹ Hartknoch, pp. 455-456. *Erläutertes Preussen*, iii. 284-297. Baczko, iv. 272 ff. Hase, pp. 294-309, 329, 350. Vulpius, x. 39-53, who cannot give up his 'conviction' that Scalich 'was a tool of the Jesuits'!

the council implicated in his guilt were beheaded on the charge of being malefactors and disturbers of the public peace. The crowd gathered round to witness their execution, sang '*Nun bitten wir den heiligen Geist*' ('Now pray we to the Holy Ghost') and '*Du werthes Licht, gib uns deinen Schein*' ('Lead us, kindly light. . .').¹

At the request of the Estates, Mörlin, who had been banished twelve years before, was recalled as 'a rock of true doctrine,' and appointed Bishop of Samland.

This man, in conjunction with the Brunswick divine, Martin Chemnitz, compiled a new symbol in which the Augsburg Confession and the Smalcald Articles were incorporated, and in which, among other 'erroneous doctrine,' Osianderism was emphatically condemned.² The new formula was solemnly ratified by the Duke and pronounced by him binding on Prussia for evermore. From that time all preachers and teachers were obliged to swear conformity to it.³

In an ecclesiastical statute of the Duke we read as follows : 'Because the poor clergy are as a rule so miserably paid that they have little more than crusts of bread to eat, nobody goes in for deep and accurate learning: only poor people without other means of existence, after some superficial studies, teach what they themselves do not understand, the blind thus leading the blind. The pure doctrine is lost, our temporal sustenance and welfare dwindle away, for God everywhere withdraws His blessings, and we, as

¹ Hase, pp. 354 ff.

² Later on known as the *Corpus doctrinæ Prutenicum*.

³ Hase, pp. 384 ff.

the prophet Aggeus says, put our money in bags with holes.'¹

Duke Albert died two years after the execution of his chaplain, 'deeply distressed at the deplorable condition of the clergy and the people.' 'We have, alas, very few pastors of souls,' he lamented, 'but quite a swarm of hirelings and storks.' The discontent and disaffection among the people were so general that the Duke was frequently heard to say he had 'no faithful subjects left in the land ;' he would rather 'be a tender of sheep than ruler of the country.'²

In his family life also the former Grandmaster of the Teutonic Order 'had had almost incessant tribulation and crosses.' Out of seven children by his first marriage, with a daughter of the Danish King, six had died at a tender age, and only one daughter had survived. Albert Frederic, the only son of his second marriage, with Anna Maria, Princess of Brunswick, who outlived him, spent his life in constant terror of being poisoned by the people around him. 'They worried and plagued my father,' he said, 'down to his grave, and they are doing the same by me ; God punishes us to the third and fourth generation !' He often had such terrible fits of violence that he would throw silver tankards at the heads of those at table with him, and then would fall into so great melancholy that those around him feared he might commit suicide.³

The contentions and mutual recriminations on account of religion were never-ending. The Königsberg professor David Voit had said in 1567 that he feared 'an invasion of barbarism.'⁴

¹ Richter, *Kirchenordnungen*, ii. 301-302.

² Hase, pp. 235, 343.

³ Hase, pp. 79, 288, 395-396.

⁴ 'Deum oro, ut in his regionibus ecclesias, politic as, et oeconomias

Bishop Mörlin underwent the most bitter persecution from the Melanchthonians at the university, and from the still numerous sect of Osianderites ; and, like Osiander, he too was insulted on his death-bed. One of his opponents writes of him : ‘ he fell into a state of desperation before his end ; he crawled on all fours like a bear, and scratched the ground with his nails ; knives had to be hidden from him and the door closed against him. Verses were stuck up on the cathedral announcing that “ Mörlin had gone down to Lucifer in the abyss of hell.” ’¹

Tilmann Hesshus was appointed Bishop of Samland in Mörlin’s place. Owing to the Duke’s ill-health he enjoyed for several years unlimited power, and he made his adversaries at the university, and all over the country, fully aware of the fact by excommunication and deposition. He procured the bishopric of Pomesania for his friend John Wigand. But he soon became involved in a fierce quarrel with him, and with several preachers, because of his teaching that the humanity of Christ is also, *in abstracto*, omnipotent and omniscient and worthy of adoration, whereas this ought only to be asserted of Christ’s human nature *in concreto*—that is, in union with the Divine nature.

The disputed question soon became the theme of discussion in all churches and lecture-rooms. ‘ Some professors and rectors,’ Wigand wrote, ‘ have taught the children that *abstractum* is a compound of *abs* and *tractum*, just as the wolf-skins or seal-skins, which

clementer servet, nec sinat fieri barbaricam vastitatem, quam cum multa alia, tunc vero præcipue intestini motus portendunt’ (to Camerarius, in Döllinger, ii. 666, note).

¹ *Erläutertes Preussen*, iv. 747–748. See Leuckfeld, *Hist. Hessh.* pp. 89–92.

great lords wear, are the fur coats taken off wolves and seals.'

The flood of controversy poured like a mountain cataract among the students and among the people.¹ It found its way also into taverns and hostels. 'At social gatherings, on convivial occasions, at conferences, in every trumpery shop, conversation turned chiefly on the topic of *abstractum* and *concretum*, and everywhere there was loud and angry quarrelling on the subject. The preachers contributed largely to the sum of irritation by incensing their congregations against their opponents from the pulpit.'² 'Wigand,' wrote his former friend, Andreas von Meyendorf, 'is being egged on by Satan to ruin Heshus; he rages and raves just like a madman, and cries out continually, "Away with this man!"'³

At a synod of twenty pastors, presided over by Wigand, the following decision was pronounced: 'The proposition that the humanity of Christ in *abstracto* (*i.e.* in itself) is almighty, is blasphemous and is herewith rejected with loathing from the Church, and abolished for all eternity. The highest exigencies of godliness demand that Heshus should amend, and express contrition for, the extremely dangerous and offensive language which he has used. And whereas bitterness and hatred are rampant throughout Prussia, it must be proclaimed with all possible temperance from the pulpits that the proposition of *abstractum* has been unanimously condemned, and that the Bishop of Samland will correct his offensive speeches, for the

¹ Wilkens, pp. 206-214.

² Hartknoch, p. 466.

³ Leuckfeld, pp. 145-146.

sake of the glory of God, and so that they shall no longer scandalise anybody.'

Hesshus, however, refused to submit to the decree of the synod. 'Write me down a Dutchman if ever I consent to such a decision ! If it is carried, I harness my horses in God's name, and bid farewell to Prussia. Uhu ! the night-owls and field demons may stay there if they like.' As for the synod, he said, he repudiated its authority ; for, according to the laws of the land, only a general synod could pronounce judgment on a bishop ; and as for Wigand, in whose person the devil himself had presided, he had laid a snare for all future bishops. 'This synod,' Wigand answered, 'was as legitimate a tribunal as that which had met in the house of Zacharias, when the article on the birth of Christ had been ratified by three persons only. The child could not teach the father. Had not the ass instructed Balaam ?' Hesshus defended himself from the Königsberg pulpit, and the populace threatened to shoot down all the followers of Wigand and hack them in pieces, so that their blood should cover the ground. Everything was to be turned topsy-turvy. Wigand rejected all petitions sent up to the town council of Königsberg as 'fruit not grown in the garden of Eden.'

At the ducal court there was great indecision for a long time as to what line to take with regard to this controversy, which threatened to lead to a 'terrible conflagration.' At length the Duke, still a prey to ill-health, determined to take the matter into his own hands, and decreed that 'as the Bishop of Samland refused to alter the offensive passages, not because they were false in themselves, but only because they

had been falsely expounded to him, he (the Duke) had resolved to rid himself of the bishop, and he requested his episcopal grace to vacate his palace within six days.¹

'Wigand has managed,' Heshus wrote to the Duchess of Saxony, 'by cunning and fraud and base intrigues, to get me out of my post and himself put into it. I could never have believed that such treachery, deceit, and falsehood lurked in the bosom of this theologian. He is one of those stars that the tail of the dragon in the Apocalypse drew from heaven and cast upon the earth.'²

And now, 'in order to prevent the impending disturbances, to bring the chaplains to order and the country clergy under control, to clear out the evil leaven from the university, and to furnish the Church with a head,'³ Wigand, in the presence of the whole ducal court, was proclaimed administrator of the diocese of Samland. All the followers of Heshus were compelled to leave the country. 'Poor, faithful, godly preachers,' wrote Andrew of Meyendorf, 'have been driven by Wigand, with wives and children into the greatest misery, while he remains there, as an execrable persecutor, tearing to pieces the Church in Prussia.'⁴ The superintendent of Lübeck reported that complaints without end were sent in to the Duke concerning Wigand's oppression of preachers and widows of clergymen; it was even asserted that greed of lucre had led him into usurious transactions.⁵ 'In people like Wigand there is nothing but the devil,' wrote

¹ Wilkens, pp. 212-219.

² Trier, *Anmerkungen zum Concordienbuche*, p. 390.

³ Wilkens, p. 219. ⁴ Döllinger, ii. 477, 479.

⁵ Stark, *Lübeckische Kirchenhistorie*, Beiläge, s. 478.

the Tübinger chancellor, James Andreä, to the Duke ; ‘ he ought to be deposed and sent about his business.’¹ Wigand, on the other hand, called his adversaries ‘ bedevilled wretches, ranters, and knaves,’ and painted the conditions of the duchy in the most dismal colours. ‘ Screamers and agitators,’ he wrote, ‘ go about bewildering and leading astray, not only the simple populace, but the upper classes also. They go in and out of houses, shops, and taverns, like so many madmen, forcing their false, abominable opinions on men and women of all sorts and conditions. Young children also, whom Christ forbade men to offend, are poisoned and misled by these rascals, who instil into their minds false doctrines and hatred against orthodox teachers. Scurrilous pamphlets, scattered about everywhere, rouse much disaffection and incite people to rebel against their rulers in everything—in political as well as in religious matters. It is an every-day matter-of-course thing now to write insulting calumnies outside the doors of houses, to distribute pasquinades wholesale among the people, and to assail passers-by in the streets with offensive language.’²

He fell foul especially of the evangelical people, complaining of them in various publications, that they were sunk in epicurean sensuality, and that they set no store by their deliverance from the abomination of popish darkness, and the rekindling of evangelical light by means of Luther ; that they became more and more lawless and covetous, and abandoned themselves more and more to luxury and drunkenness ; the Church and the preachers were no longer maintained and cared for as they had been under the papacy ;

¹ Döllinger, ii. 478.

² Hartknoch, pp. 480-481.

it was scarcely possible even to keep the roofs over the houses of God. ‘Now that people are constantly preached to that they will not be justified by works, they no longer trouble themselves about doing good, and they neglect the poor. It is a common occurrence for the temporal rulers to lay violent hands on ecclesiastical property which is intended for the maintenance of churches, schools, hospitals, and poor-houses, and without more ado they add it to their own secular possessions.’ The schools are going to ruin, and we hear in all directions most melancholy accounts of the apparently hopeless depravity of the young.¹

That the ‘Abstractum had abstracted his bishopric from Heshus’ caused the loudest jubilation among the Calvinists whom he, ‘as the defender of Christ, had been compelled to consign to the devil.’² ‘Murder and adultery,’ Heshus said in his *Treue Warnung an seine lieben Preussen* (‘Sincere Admonition to his beloved Prussians’), were child’s play in comparison with the sin of associating with Calvinists.³

But it was the Calvinists of the Palatinate who passed especially as ‘accursed blasphemers of the Lord God.’ ‘Terrible reports’ about them were current among the Lutheran population: they were said to have degraded ‘the holy feast into an orgy of gluttony and drunkenness, at which the body of the Lord was devoured with spoons, the wine drunk convivially, the sacred elements trampled under foot and thrown to the dogs. Children in the Palatinate were not baptised till they reached the age of seven.’⁴

¹ See Döllinger, *die Aussprüche*, ii. 480–484.

² Wilkens, p. 219.

³ *Ibid.* p. 200.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 127.

CHAPTER XIV

CALVINISM IN THE PALATINATE

WHEN, at the Naumburg Convention, Frederic III. made the discovery that ‘popish doctrine’ concerning the Holy Communion was taught in the original version of the Augsburg Confession, the whole authority of that Confession was destroyed in his eyes. In Luther’s writings, moreover, much appeared to him erroneous and contradictory, and he pronounced it to be a duty incumbent on his office to extirpate these errors, above all ‘that doctrine of the corporeal presence of Christ “which had stuck to Luther,” and which was the chief bulwark of the whole papacy.’

He regarded also with special aversion the new dogma of the omnipresence of Christ’s human nature, which the Lutheran theologians of Würtemberg had set up, and by which, so it seemed to him, ‘the humanity of Christ was as good as annihilated, or attenuated into an element so subtle that it pervaded all inanimate nature—stones, wood, foliage, grass, apples, pears, &c. &c.; and was found in animal nature also, even in stinking swine, and, as some one had said to the old Landgrave, it was actually present in the great barrel of wine at Stuttgart.’¹

Moreover, the manner of life of his associates in the faith by no means satisfied him. He observed, he

¹ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 587.

said, that the preaching of ‘the Gospel’ had, so far, not produced any good fruit in Germany. ‘We have now had the pure teaching of the Gospel and the Word of God,’ he wrote to his son-in-law, John Frederic of Saxony, ‘proclaimed to us for more than forty years, we have made and still make loud and constant profession of it, but we do not get the right hold of it. For, although this doctrine is pure and clear, it produces little improvement in our lives; on the contrary, to judge from outward appearances, many papists may well be preferred before us, while we undoubtedly exceed them in over-eating and drinking, gambling, dice, immorality, hatred, and envy.’ ‘I fear me,’ he wrote on another occasion, ‘that the righteous God, who does not let sin go unpunished, will one day chasten us with a heavy scourge; for does He not see that while we boast with high-sounding words of our most Christian Confession of Augsburg, we nevertheless indulge without fear in the gross vices of gluttony, drunkenness, fornication, blasphemy, gambling, usury, greed, as though we were free to do just as we like?’ And again: ‘Such execrable vices as gluttony, drunkenness, blasphemy, usury and covetousness, which are abominations even to the heathen who know not God, are not considered sinful by us.’ ‘We make a great to do about the Augsburg Confession and boast inordinately of it, but we live all the while in libertinism and easy-going security, as though this Confession were only a cloak to cover us with, and there could be no doubt that the Lord God would be gracious unto us because we acknowledge the Confession of Augsburg.’¹

The Elector entered into active relations with the

¹ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 478–486, 537.

leading Zwinglian and Calvinistic theologians. In the work of reconstructing the Church organisation of the Palatinate, he relied chiefly on the services of the two Calvinistic professors at Heidelberg, Caspar Olevian and Zacharias Ursinus. Radical iconoclastic measures were at once instituted. By the Elector's orders the churches in Heidelberg underwent a complete transformation. The still existing altars and images were everywhere removed and replaced by plain tables ; the wall-pictures were whitewashed ; ordinary bread was substituted for the wafers, common wooden beakers for the chalices, tin basins for the stone fonts ; and the organs were all locked up. On being reprimanded for these proceedings by Duke John Frederic of Saxony, the Elector answered that Christ and the apostles had not used chalices, and that these things had grown out of a special form of idolatry ; stone fonts also were frequently ‘abused for all sorts of idolatry and witchcraft.’¹ The wafers, which were still used by the Lutherans, he called ‘idolatrous bits of bread,’ and he said he had had them taken away because he found that ‘they led to such superstitious practices among his subjects, who worshipped them as though they were truly God.’² Frederic also pronounced the crucifixes to be ‘works of idolatry,’ and again he issued a stern decree that every corner of the land was to be inspected, and every bit of ‘that sort of rubbish, either inside or outside the churches, to be cleared away.’³ He notified to the Lutherans at Amberg that he could not tolerate idolatry in his principality : within eight days every idolatrous work ‘must be taken away and destroyed,

¹ Struve, pp. 106–108.

² Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 372, note.

³ Sudhoff, pp. 140–141.

whether pictures or sculpture, and that not only from the churches but from every place where such things were to be found.' At Hirschau the preacher himself carried out the Elector's orders and 'destroyed all the altars and other furniture in his church.'¹

In 1562, by order of Frederic III., Thomas Erast, professor of medicine at Heidelberg, drew up a 'well-grounded report' on the Eucharist, in which Luther's dogma is diametrically opposed. The following year there appeared the 'Heidelberg Catechism,' compiled by Ursinus and Olevian, and calculated to remove any remaining doubts as to whether 'the Elector Frederic was wholly Calvinistic in faith.' Published in the name of the Elector, this Catechism obtained recognition as the authorised Creed of the Church of the Palatinate, and gained entry into all those German countries which in the course of years had gone over to the novel opinions. Later on the synod of Dordrecht invested it with the authority of a symbol of faith. After the Catechism had been thus recognised and sanctioned by a synod of the Palatinate and published with a preface dated January 19, 1563, another edition was brought out, in which Frederic inserted the notorious 80th clause on the Catholic Mass, which ended with the following words: 'And thus the Mass is at bottom nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and passion of Jesus Christ.' But the Elector was not satisfied even with this. In a third edition he added these words: 'and an accursed piece of idolatry.'²

¹ Muck, ii. 93-94.

² Kluckhohn, in the Munich *Histor. Jahrbuch*, 1866, v. 500-502, and *Friedrich der Fromme*, p. 134. See A. Wolters, *Der Heidelberger Catechismus in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt nebst der Geschichte seines*

Thus it became an important part of the religious training of the young that they should be taught to despise Catholics as idolaters.

A letter of Frederic to his son-in-law, John Frederic, on May 10, 1562, gives a good insight into his state of mind. He writes : ‘It is to be regretted that the Huguenots at Lyons contented themselves with only driving out the monks and priests, and did not massacre them wholesale.’¹

Seeing that this Elector regarded ‘all popish belief and forms of worship as mere devil-worship,’ it is not to be wondered at that he should have embarked on a campaign of complete annihilation against all Catholic institutions, churches, cloisters, and religious houses. He showed no regard whatever for the stipulations of the Augsburg Confession. In the Rhenish Palatinate alone he confiscated the property of forty religious houses and other Catholic foundations ; at a later date the Bishop of Worms reckoned the number of ecclesiastical institutions that had been seized in the Palatinate, inclusive of parish churches, at 300.² Frederic proceeded, with even greater violence than Duke Christopher of Würtemberg, against the poor defenceless nuns instance the nuns of Himmelskrone and Liebenau, who entreated in vain that ‘whereas

Textes im Jahre 1563; Bonn, 1864. Niepmann, *Der Heidelberger Catechismus von 1563*; Elberfeld, 1866. Gooszen, *De Heidelbergse catechismen. Textus receptus met toelichtende teksten. Bijdrage tot de kennis van zijne wordingsgeschiedenis en van het gereformeerde protestantisme*; Leiden, 1890, und Gooszen, *De Heidelbergse catechismen en het boekje van de breking des broeds*; Leiden, 1893. See Zarneke’s *Literar. Centralblatt*, 1890, No. 23, and 1893, No. 41.

¹ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 297; see i. 126–127.

² See Ritter’s *August von Sachsen und Friedrich III.*, s. 310; Häusser, ii. 27; see also Ritter, i. 201.

the Jews had been left in the enjoyment of their religion, the nuns ought to be allowed the same freedom.'¹ At Liebenau the prioress Anna von Seckendorf, and all the twenty-two sisters under her care, told the electoral commissioners that they had no intention of letting themselves be turned away from their faith, which for many centuries had stood its ground as a true and good Christian belief; they meant to persist firmly in it. Likewise, they said, it was impossible that anybody could be annoyed by the sight of their traditional dress, as they never went outside the convent. They therefore humbly prayed his electoral grace not to force them to renounce it. They could not submit to a preacher, they declared; and if one was foisted on them, they should not listen to him; 'they could not do with all the different creeds that were preached nowadays.'²

¹ Further details on the treatment of convents in Falk, pp. 50-73.

² Report of the electoral commissioners of March 25, 1563, in Büttinghausen, ii. 378-379. For the proceedings of the Elector against the nuns of Marienkrone at Oppenheim, see F. Falk's article in the *Histor. Jahrbuch* of the Görresgesellschaft, Bd. 10 (1889), 47-66. Much light is thrown on the history of the period by the accounts of a nun from Pforzheim (printed by Holzwarth in the *Katholische Trösteinsamkeit* 12; Mayence, 1858) on the veritably scandalous treatment which her convent had to suffer from 1556, for eight years, at the hands of the preachers and officials of Charles II. of Baden. During the first six years no less than eighteen preachers were at work in the convent trying to make the nuns abjure their faith. Not one of them, however, could be persuaded to break the vows of her Order. 'But we could do nothing of ourselves,' says the Sister, 'we give the glory to God. One of the preachers scolded us in the most abominable manner, and called us all such bad names, and abused our Father Confessors worse still, calling them stud stallions, stud bulls, mass sows, murderers of souls, and other vile names, which would take too long to write down; and he often raised such an uproar over us that it was a wonder the whole town did not flock to the convent.' 'Another of them spoke so disgracefully and sacrilegiously of the Sacrament, I never heard the like of it before . . . He preached of and against the Papal Holiness . . . whatever monks and

Frederic knew no mercy. In his frenzy of destruction against all monuments of former Christian worship,

nuns dreamed, he said, must be conformed to in the churches, as though it had been revealed by the Holy Ghost. All our work too, he said, aimed at making people gape in wonderment at skinning and fleecing the poor, for which we got great profit . . . he said we were hardened and bewitched, and recklessly making for eternal damnation. He packed us all off to hell as if God had made him our judge. A third preacher read us such a sermon against our vows and our statutes that I only wonder what a man can be thinking of to talk to others in such a way,' and so forth. 'Whenever the Margrave's chancellor came into the convent he used to rush straight into the dormitory without giving us notice, and we knew nothing of it till we heard him screaming out, and then we used to be frightened and to run away; then he would tear from one cell to another like a maniac, and he would behave in such a manner . . . that our honour would not have been safe if we had not protected one another,' &c. It was all in vain that the nuns represented to the officials that in former days no poor person had been 'sent away unrelieved from the convent, but that now the poor were driven from the convent like dogs without even having a morsel of bread given them; and yet the convent had been founded for the sake of bestowing alms, and most of its property belonged to the poor. The convent revenues were dissipated, and altars and images of saints destroyed.' Not for eight long years did 'the day of deliverance' come for the nuns, and deliverance meant only permission to leave the convent. 'When at last we went out of the convent, such a crowd of people came flocking round, young and old, that in all my life I have never seen more people collected together. They were all weeping; but the cries and laments of the poor sounded above all the others, and they followed us a long way. And when we came away from the convent the daughters of the steward fell a weeping. Then their father was very angry with them, and one of them he nearly beat to death, and he kicked the other, and said that he should not cry over us even if the devil himself had carried us off.' The nuns went to Kilchberg (Königsberg) in the county of Hochberg, where the sisters of their own order gave them a home. No less brutal was the treatment of the convents in Saxony. See, for instance, in Weber's *Aus vier Jahrhunderten*, Neue Folge, i. 19-21, the proceedings instituted by the Elector Augustus of Saxony against the nuns of the convent of the Holy Cross at Meissen. When all efforts to make the nuns there apostatise had proved fruitless, Augustus, on September 2, 1557, issued orders 'to stop the food of all those sisters who had not abjured their idolatry by St. Martin's Day.' Concerning the treatment of the defenceless nuns at Würtemberg, see above, pp. 79 ff. Concerning the persecution of the Mecklenburg nuns, see Schurinacher's *Johann Albert* i., 337 f. See also Paulus's *Glaubens-*

he did not confine himself to the departments under his own sole jurisdiction, but ‘launched out also against churches and cloisters, the patronage of which he shared with other princes, and in many cases against some over which he had no authority at all.’ For instance, in October 1564, he instituted iconoclastic proceedings in the village of Dirnstein, which was the joint property of himself and the Bishop of Worms, and ordered all altars, images, and church furniture there to be broken up or carted away. At Simten in the Palatinate, the Elector took the sacred Host with his own hand out of the Ciborium, and began a disputation with it, saying: ‘See what a splendid God you are! You think you’re stronger than I am? No indeed;’ whereupon Frederic III. broke the sacred Host in pieces, uttering the most profane blasphemies. A portion of it, which remained in his hand, he threw into the fire in which he had burnt the decorations of the altars, the images, and other articles belonging to the service of the church.¹

‘The new Josiah,’ ‘the pious Frederic,’ as the court theologians called the Elector, repeatedly chose for his iconoclastic sport the seasons most sacred to the Catholics. On Thursday in Holy Week, in the year 1565, accompanied by several divines, he appeared in the abbey of St. Michael at Sinsheim, which had been founded by a bishop of Spires, and which ‘had no connection with the Electoral Palatinate.’ Some

treue der Lüneburger Klosterfrauen im sechzehnten Jahrhundert, in *Histor.-polit. Blätter*, pp. 112, 625–649.

¹ Wonderful to relate, these particles were afterwards found under the ashes unconsumed. The Bishop of Spires saw them in the possession of the Dean of Simten. So says the Baron de Bolwiller, on June 28, 1565. *Papiers d'État du Card. de Granvelle*, ix. 372.

workmen ‘who had been brought there for the purpose were then let loose to break open the choir and to tear down the altars and wainscotics, and to carry out of the church the carved images, the church vestments, the ornaments of the sacristy, the Blessed Sacrament (in the monstrance), several consecrated wafers, and also the crucifixes with the psalters, the graduals, the antiphonaries, and other things that were in the choir. Frederic ordered all these treasures to be broken in pieces and publicly burnt in his presence.’ The next day he behaved in precisely the same manner in the parish church of the village of Steinfurt, belonging to the abbey of Sinsheim. He committed similar outrages on Good Friday in the parish church of Ladenburg, which was incorporated with the chapter of Worms, as well as in the hospital of this place, and in the parish churches of two other places; he also burnt down the libraries. On May 9 of the same year the Elector, so we read in a report, ‘went in person to attack the abbey of Neuhausen (an immediate fief of the Empire), took it, ravaged and destroyed all the property belonging to it, and burnt the images and ornaments in the church, and all the psalters and other books.’ The inmates were thrown into prison, and all their property, both movable and immovable, was taken possession of. In the other places already mentioned the Elector also appropriated all church property.¹ The Margrave

¹ Fuller details in Struve, pp. 170–187. Concerning Sinsheim, see K. Wilhelmi in the *Schriften des Alterthumsvereins für das Grossherzogthum Baden*, i. 258 ff. At Ladenburg the pictures had already before been partly destroyed. A preacher of the place ‘indulged in the utmost abuse and insolence against the Bishop of Worms, with scandalous imprecations and calumnies from the pulpit; on several different occasions sent his fists through the pictures, or belaboured them with clubs and other

Philibert of Baden, who was a Lutheran, complained that in the former county of Sponheim, which he owned in common with the Elector, Frederic, ‘despite the Augsburg Confession, had made alterations in the manner of administering the Communion, and in other things had been guilty of iconoclasm, and had established the Calvinistic sect in the land.’¹ The knights, the town council, and the burghers of Oppenheim all made similar complaints. On May 15, 1565, they said, the Elector with his preachers had made a personal visitation of their parishes, and had unlawfully deposed the Lutheran pastors whom they had appointed, had set up preachers in their places, had

weapons, burnt many of them, and made a public boast of his proceedings from the pulpit.’ On Christmas Eve, 1564, while the Bishop, with his pastor and chaplain, was chanting vespers, this preacher, with the schoolmaster and his pupils, made a disturbance in the church and insulted the Bishop. The latter sent a letter of complaint to the Elector, but Frederic returned it unopened. From the ‘Acten in Schuech,’ *Polit. und Kirchengesch. von Ladenburg* (Heidelberg, 1843), s. 156–157.

¹ The Hessian councillors to the Landgrave Philip, on April 19, 1566, in Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 655. See the *Actenstücke*, published by Falk in the *Histor. Jahrbuch*, xii. 38 ff. from the Munich imperial archives. For Frederic’s ‘Reformation’ in the town of Oppenheim, which had accrued to the Palatinate by mortgage, and in the imperial villages of the so-called Ingelheim Grund, see the article of F. Falk in the *Histor.-polit. Blätter*, pp. 100, 255–267, the materials for which are gathered from hitherto unpublished Acts. In these Acts is the following, among other statements: ‘Firstly, their electoral graces abolished everything that still remained of popish idolatry, daily prayer in the choir . . . item, the pictures, images, altars, and everything in the shape of vestments or other objects of ritual which served for outward idolatry.’ With regard to Oppenheim a special decree was issued that not only all altars, but also ‘crucifixes and other idolatrous objects in front of the door were to be destroyed, and also the idol which was between the two gates was to be removed from thence . . . also that the three crucifixes on the tombs of the Lords of Dienheim, the two upper ones, and the one carved beneath, were to be removed. The field-churches are also to be cleared of idolatrous symbols, and the inhabitants are to be allowed to take away the wood, slates, and walls.’

cleared out the churches, tearing down and breaking much that was in them, and had appointed a fresh collector of ecclesiastical revenues.¹

But the heaviest charges of all against Frederic were raised by his Lutheran cousin, the Count Palatine Wolfgang of Zweibrücken. In February 1565 Wolfgang sent in to one of the electoral councillors a written statement to the effect that ‘The Elector was coercing servants of the Church and subjects of the Palatinate to join his new Calvinistic sect, and compelling all who refused to obey to leave the land. In many places there were no more clergymen left; the churches were not attended and no sermons preached; where formerly there had been 50 or even 100 communicants at the Eucharist, not more than five were now seen; whereas there was no instruction or education for the young, it was to be feared that terrible epicureanism would set in. Furthermore, the Elector was confiscating all the cloisters and using their revenues for profane purposes, taking away all the ornaments and treasures from the churches, handing over the cloisters to people from Brabant, from England, and to men and women attached to the Calvinistic sect. He was also oppressing the inhabitants of the Palatinate with unheard-of taxes, so that many of them were obliged to leave their homes with their wives and children and take to begging.’²

The Count Palatine Wolfgang, Duke Christopher of Würtemberg, and the Margrave Charles of Baden

¹ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 658, note 1.

² *Ibid.* i. 563–569. Wolfgang made many other complaints besides the above; many of them are unjust, many exaggerated. See the editor’s notes.

had before this pointed out repeatedly to the Elector the danger of Zwinglian and Calvinist doctrine, which they said contained damnable error respecting the Blessed Sacrament and baptism, and which taught that God had not destined all men for salvation, and that no sin could be committed except through the will of God. Frederic, however, in his answers had always appealed to the Holy Scriptures, and he was as firmly convinced that his interpretation of them was the only right one as each of the different Protestant theologians and princes was certain that his was the only true interpretation. ‘As for the writings of Zwingli, Calvin, and Luther,’ said the Elector, ‘we only let ourselves be guided by them in so far as they coincide with the Word of God; all else we pay no heed to.’ His doctrine of the Sacrament and his Heidelberg Catechism, he said, ‘were not based on the teaching of any human being, but only on God’s Word;’ he did not intend to be drawn ‘into a disputation about them with any one;’ he would not have his people perplexed and bewildered by every fresh ‘demagogue preacher,’ nor would he allow ‘erroneous doctrine to be introduced in his dominions under the semblance of the Augsburg Confession;’ he wished his subjects to enjoy ‘the honest, sound teaching of the Word of God,’ no matter what the world said.¹ He told the Landgrave of Hesse that the other Protestant princes also had not held by the Augsburg Confession; there were ‘many things in this Confession which were not fully explained (as for instance the article on the

¹ Heppe, *Gesch. des Protestantismus*, 2; *Beil.* 5-11, 12-26; Kugler, ii. 439 ff.

Mass), and which had afterwards been altered by the princes in their respective principalities and towns.'¹

In order to win over Duke Christopher to his religious opinions, Frederic persuaded him to convene a religious conference, which took place in April 1564, at the monastery of Maulbronn in Würtemberg. It consisted of Palatine and Würtemberg theologians, and was held in the presence of the respective ruling princes, lasting from April 10 to April 15. This conference, however, only increased the mutual bitterness of feeling. The Heidelberg theologians spread abroad the report that 'the Würtembergers, as was patent to all present, had suffered so crushing a defeat at Maulbronn that Duke Christopher had now actually become reconciled to the teaching of the Heidelberg Catechism.² With regard to the Sacrament, Luther, they said, shortly before his death, had acknowledged, in a talk with Melanchthon, that the Zwinglian doctrine on this point was more in harmony with the Scriptures than his own; he had begged Melanchthon after his death to look into the matter afresh.³ Christopher, on his part, caused another report of the conference, adverse to the Heidelbergers, to be drawn up. In this document it was stated that the Heidelbergers had indulged in continual sophistry throughout the conference, now denying some point, now reasserting it; they had themselves not known what they were driving at. The Duke and his councillors had thus been greatly

¹ Vilmar, p. 294. *Beil.* 2.

² Heppe, *Gesch. des Protestantismus*, ii. 73-94. Kugler, ii. 458 f.

³ Protocol of the Maulbronn Colloquy, in the *Gegenbericht*, f. 217. See, on the other hand, Anton. i. 34-36.

strengthened in their own creed, and they now entertained greater loathing than ever for the fearful errors and blasphemies of the Heidelberg faction. One ‘especially terrible and abominably blasphemous statement of theirs’ was ‘that they called Christ’s presence in the bread nothing but an idolatrous invention of the human brain.’ As for the dogma of the Majesty of Christ, the Würtembergers placed ‘the Turkish Alkoran and the Zwinglian tenet’ on one and the same level.¹

The theologians of Würtemberg and of the Palatinate quarrelled with each other, and the Wittenbergers quarrelled with both these parties. They rejected the Heidelberg Catechism, but they also repudiated the Würtemberg dogma of the omnipresence of Christ’s human nature as one of the rankest of heresies. In this matter both Wittenbergers and Würtembergers appealed to Luther, the first of them asserting that Luther had in after years emphatically retracted his earlier doctrine of omnipresence, the others declaring that this was by no means the case. John Brenz and James Andreä, Christopher’s leading theologians, assured the Duke that they had always been ‘at pains to follow Luther’s footsteps undeviatingly;’ if it could be proved to them that ‘even in the matter of a few words only, they had digressed from Luther’s doctrine,’ they would gladly retract.²

Christopher, taking part with his theologians, would not have it said that his dogma of omnipresence was novel, ‘unheard-of teaching;’ Frederic, with equal

¹ *Christliche Erklärung, &c.*, pp. 35, 195.

² Heppe, *Gesch. des Protestantismus*, ii. 101 ff.

firmness, repudiated the charge of introducing ‘unheard-of innovations.’ While Frederic indulged in anathematising language against ubiquity,¹ Christopher denounced the Heidelberg doctrine of the Sacrament as ‘venomous poison and stiff-necked wickedness.’

It had been expressly stated in the terms of the Religious Peace of Augsburg that this treaty only included the Catholic Estates and those who were adherents of the Augsburg Confession. ‘All the other Estates which belonged neither to the old religion nor were adherents of the Augsburg Confession were not included in this Pacification, but were wholly excluded from it.’ The princes who were meant by the phrase ‘The Estates adhering to the Augsburg Confession with its tenets, Church customs, ordinances, and ceremonies’ could only, according to the clear wording of the treaty, be such as accepted the doctrines of the Confession as originally sent to Charles V.; not such, however, as accepted the Confession as a matter of form, while they disputed and rejected its doctrinal contents.

This was manifestly the case with Frederic III.

In order to remain a participator in the benefits of the Religious Peace, the Elector was in the habit of appealing to the Augsburg Confession, and he endeavoured to harmonise the Heidelberg Catechism with the terms of the Pacification by the following syllogistic method: ‘The Augsburg Confession is in accord with the Word of God; the Catechism also is in accord with the Word of God; it follows therefore that whatever in the terms of the Peace applies to the one, applies to the other also.’ The Empire, however, was not concerned with the question whether this or that

¹ See above, p. 313.

doctrine was in harmony with the Word of God, but whether it corresponded to the tenets of the Augsburg Confession.

It remained to be seen whether Emperor and Empire would recognise the Elector's argument as valid, and, on the strength of it, would be ready to grant Calvinism also the protection of the Religious Pacification.

CHAPTER XV

RELIGIOUS ATTITUDE OF MAXIMILIAN II. UP TO 1566
—TRANSACTIONS CONCERNING CALVINISM IN THE
PALATINATE

THE Emperor Ferdinand was utterly helpless against the progress of Protestantism and the religious dissension and fighting within the Empire. He had ‘ quite as much to do as he could manage,’ as he said once to a Franciscan monk, ‘ with the Turks and with the sectarian innovations in his own hereditary dominions.’¹ Against the Augsburg Religious Peace, which he himself had brought about, and which was responsible for the loss of unity in the Church and for sanctioning the maxim : ‘ Wessen das Land, dessen die Religion,’² a stern protest had been raised by the papal see; but of Ferdinand individually Paul IV. had written, on December 4, 1556, to the Emperor’s eldest son Maximilian, King of Bohemia, that he could point him to no better example, among sovereigns of the present time, than his own father, whose piety and fear of God he would do well to imitate.³ An admonition of this sort was very opportune, for Maximilian had early begun to stray from the footsteps of his father. Before his marriage, in 1548, with his cousin Maria, daughter of

¹ *Wider die sectirischen Rumohrmacher*, pp. 5–6.² ‘ Whose the land, his the religion.’³ Raynald ad a. 1556, Nos. 16, 17.

Charles V., he had been by no means blameless in moral respects;¹ and later on he caused his father much and bitter grief by the religious attitude which he took up.² In spite of all the trouble that Ferdinand

¹ Bucholtz, iv. 468 f. and Huber, p. 220.

² The religious attitude of Maximilian II. was dealt with in the last century in dissertations (see Krones, iii. 267), and the question has again lately been subjected to minute investigation by Reimann (*Religiöse Entwicklung Maximilian's II.* pp. 1-28), by Maurenbrecher (in v. Sybel's *Histor. Zeitschrift*, vii. 351-380; xxxii. 221-297; l. 17-31), by Brieger (*Preuss. Jahrb.* 33), by Reitzer (*Zur Gesch. des religiösen Wandlung Maximilian's II.*; Leipzig, 1870), by Götz und Walter (in the *Mono-graphien über die Wahl Maximilian's*). See also *Märkische Forschungen*, xiii. 330; *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1873, pp. 721-727; Gothein, pp. 725, 730; Moritz, pp. 18 and 438 f. To these works may be added that of Hopfen, published in 1895 and based on fresh authentic material, a work which certainly leaves much to be desired, and in which there are some very important omissions (see Paulus, in the *Histor. Jahrbuch*, xvi. 599 ff.). In agreement with Stieve, Hopfen attributes to the Emperor the so-called Catholicism of compromise. Loserth (*Allgem. Zeitung*, 1896, Beil. No. 105: *Aus den Lehrjahren Kaiser Maximilian's II.*) agrees with Hopfen, except that he thinks the date of Maximilian's adopting independent religious opinions is fixed at too late a period. Paulus (l.c.) and Hirn (*Literaturblatt der Leo-Gesellschaft*, 1896, pp. 361 f.) have, in my opinion, proved convincingly, in opposition to Hopfen, that the Emperor cannot be absolved from the reproach of doublefacedness. Wolf also (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1895, p. 781) is of opinion that Maximilian was not free from hypocrisy. See also Forst in v. Sybel's *Histor. Zeitschrift*, lxxiii. 496, and Michael in the *Zeitschrift für kathol. Theologie*, xvi. 519 ff. The name 'Catholicism of compromise' was not very happily chosen to designate a religion which cared nothing for the Pope and very little for the bishops, rejected auricular confession, confirmation, extreme unction, and so forth. There may be a 'Protestantism of compromise,' but there is no 'Catholicism of compromise.' Whosoever rejects but one single doctrine of the Church is no longer a Catholic. What Hopfen calls 'Catholicism of compromise' is latent Protestantism. While Hopfen's work was in the press, Götz's interesting article, 'Compromise-Catholicism and the Emperor Maximilian II.' appeared in the *Histor. Zeitschrift*, lxxvii. 193-206. In these pages Hopfen is sharply criticised, and objections to the designation 'Compromise-Catholicism' are raised from other points of view. Götz declares the system pursued by Hopfen to be wrong: 'first, because he has by no means adequately arranged all his varied materials, and, secondly, because

had taken in this special direction, and all his efforts to keep doubtful influences away from his ‘restless, ambitious’ son, it was his unhappy fate to see him at an early age ‘infected with the novel sectarian opinions.’ The results of Maximilian’s contact with the eloquent court preacher John Sebastian Pfauser, who was anything but a true Catholic, were particularly disastrous. Although Ferdinand had deposed Pfauser from his office of court preacher in 1554, Maximilian sheltered him in his own house. All Ferdinand’s attempts to remove this dangerous man from his son ended in failure. The Emperor was weak enough to give in and allow the intercourse between the two to continue.¹ At the end of the year 1557 Maximilian, unbeknown to his father, took into his service the Protestant zealot Verger, an apostate from the Church.² Pfauser exercised a fatal influence over Maximilian. This man called himself a Catholic, while he combated the primacy of the Pope, and in his sermons plainly denounced all Catholics as fools, sticks, vain babblers, and destroyers of souls. On Christmas Day 1558 he preached ‘so insultingly against the Apostolic See and the Catholic Church, that the like of it,’ so the Archbishop of Salzburg wrote to the Emperor, ‘was not tolerated even in Zwinglian towns and districts.’³ Maximilian held opinions similar to Pfauser’s. In

in his one-sided treatment of the religious position of the Emperor, there lies an error of method.’ Hopfen’s new thesis on Maximilian’s attitude to religion and the Church does not coincide with facts (pp. 199 f.). Götz’s condemnation of the Emperor, if not stronger than Janssen’s, is at any rate quite as strong; he says (p. 202, note) that Maximilian ‘was first and foremost an adept at hypocrisy.’

¹ Hopfen, xvii. 22 f.

² Le Bret, p. 109; Hopfen, p. 32.

³ Wiedemann, ii. 105–114; Bucholtz, viii. 208. Concerning Pfauser, see also Braunsberger, *Epistulae Canisii*, i. 524–527, 530.

private letters to Protestant princes, especially to Duke Christopher of Würtemberg, he said frankly that he recognised the Augsburg Confession as ‘the expression of the true faith,’ spoke of Catholic ‘servants of the devil,’ of a ‘diabolical proceeding’ of the Pope, and expressed his wish that a reconciliation of the many religious differences in the Protestant camp would soon be effected, by which the Pope’s throat would be cut.’¹ He held out distinct hopes to Duke Christopher of the abolition of the Ecclesiastical Reservation.² When, in 1559, the Emperor required of him that he should dismiss Pfauser on account of his having married, he refused to do so, saying that he could not obey his father in religious matters. They might persecute him to the very utmost, he wrote on April 9, 1559, to the Brandenburg Margrave, Hans von Cüstrin, ‘and if they make it too hot for me; as they threaten, I hope I shall not be forsaken by your grace and other true Christians.’ In February 1560 he complained to the Margrave that ‘it had, alas, come to this, that the Emperor had removed his preacher from him by force; Ferdinand, in a great rage, had threatened that if his son did not get rid of the preacher he would have the man arrested and proceeded against in the way that such an heretical rogue deserved.’ So great was Maximilian’s alarm that he actually believed there were designs on his own life, ‘for they think that, if I were out of the way, everything would go as they wish.’ ‘I pray your grace not to be displeased at the contents of my letter; for I have no one to open my heart to but God Almighty, your grace, and other good Christians.’

‘The King of Spain is very influential with my

¹ See above, p. 50.

² See above, p. 104.

father ; it is his ambassadors who are chiefly instrumental in making the wheels go round at the imperial court.'¹ Finally, in the spring of 1560, Maximilian sent Pfauser to Styria as a temporary retreat, holding out to him hopes of a speedy recall, and giving him a yearly pension of 200 florins.

Maximilian, who was extremely hazy about all matters of dogma, was at that time an enthusiastic advocate for tolerance, and for casting aside dogmatic religion ; he wished for a *mixed religion* without a Pope ; he rejected auricular confession, confirmation, extreme unction, indulgences, purgatory, veneration of saints, and celibacy, and was most keenly in favour of the lay chalice.²

In April 1560 he sent a confidential agent to the electors of Saxony, Brandenburg, and the Palatinate, to Christopher of Würtemberg, Philip of Hesse, and Hans von Cüstrin, for the double purpose of obtaining advice as to how he ought to behave if his father should refuse him permission to have another Protestant preacher, and should compel him to attend the service of the Mass 'which he abhorred ;' and also to find out on what support he might reckon in case of further persecution from the Emperor and the Pope. He was determined, he said, not to pollute his conscience 'with popish abominations.'

The Protestant princes, however, did not wish to push things on to an open breach between the Emperor

¹ Meyer, pp. 566-567. *Die vollständige Correspondenz zwischen Maximilian und dem Markgrafen Hans von Cüstrin*, edited by Meyer, in the *Zeitschr. für preussische Gesch. und Landeskunde*, xv. (Berlin, 1878) 114-150.

² Hopfen, pp. 35 ff. Concerning Pfauser's dismissal, see Turba, *Venet. Depeschen*, iii. 119 f., 132.

and Maximilian, and they made no definite promises. They advised Maximilian to continue steadfast in his own opinions and, so long as the public exercise of his religion was forbidden him, to content himself with divine service under his own roof.¹

The princes evidently looked forward to a favourable turn of affairs when once Maximilian should be Emperor. The Catholics, however, were unrelenting in their efforts to win him back to the orthodox Church. Since August 1560 Maximilian had had frequent interviews with the papal nuncio, Hosius, Bishop of Ermland, who endeavoured to bring back the wanderer by pointing out to him the many contradictions among the Protestants, and their never-ending internal dissensions.

Maximilian, on these occasions, talked in such a manner as to give Hosius good grounds for expecting a successful result to his efforts.² And when the nuncio Commendone, on his way to the Naumburg convention of princes, stopped at Vienna, and in the name of the Pope invited Maximilian also to the Council of Trent, he too, to his great satisfaction, was impressed with the idea that the King was a devoted adherent of the Roman see. With eager delight he wrote back to Rome that ‘Maximilian, in a conversation on January 12, 1561, had praised the kindness and condescension of the Pope in sending his nuncios to the Protestant princes to invite them to Trent, and in addressing them as “beloved sons” in his briefs.’ ‘Pius IV.,’ the King had said,

¹ Weber, *Archiv für sächsische Gesch.* iii. 317–318. Meyer, pp. 568–570; Kugler, ii. 636–638; Rommel, ii. 577–578. Krabbe, *Chyträus*, p. 194. Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, ii. 1032–1034. Hopfen, pp. 51 ff.

² Eichhorn, *Hosius*, i. 354–382, goes too far in asserting that Hosius brought Maximilian back again to the Catholic faith. See Reimann, *Religiöse Entwicklung*, pp. 27 ff.

‘had done, if possible, almost more than he was authorised to do ; he had abundantly revealed the goodness of his heart.’ ‘The King then discussed the character of these German princes, and talked about their interests and their dissensions, saying that he considered it almost impossible that they should ever agree together concerning a confession of faith ; with regard to the Council, he had little hope of them on account of their obduracy ; he on his part, however, would certainly support this most laudable attempt of the Pope ; he did not know how he could make sufficient return for the unparalleled goodness shown him by his Holiness ; he had done nothing to deserve it ; he hoped, however, by future action to show forth all that was in his heart.’¹ Maximilian at the same time assured the ambassador of King Philip II. of Spain that he had asked a few of the Protestant princes, with whom he was on friendly terms, to attend the Council ; he also told him that he intended sending his eldest son Rudolph, a boy of eight years old, to Spain to be educated, because under the present condition of things in Germany there was considerable danger of the child’s religious instruction being tainted.²

But the very day after his conversation with Commendone, who then left Vienna for Naumburg with the Bishop Delfino, Maximilian ‘showed forth by action what was in his heart’ in a manner which revealed his character in a very bad light. On January 13, the day of the nuncio’s departure, he warned Duke Christopher

¹ ‘... In fine mi disse che non sapeva come corrispondere a l’infinita benignità di nostro signore verso di lui, e che conosceva di non l’haver mai meritata, ma che sperava per l’avvenire mostrare con l’opere l’animo suo’ (Commendone’s letter of January 13, 1561, to Charles Borromæus, in Pogiani, *Epist.* ii. 219, note m).

² Reimann, *Religiöse Entwickelung*, pp. 41-42.

of Würtemberg to be well on his guard at Naumburg ‘against these fellows.’

Two days later he spoke disparagingly to the Duke about “this conciliabulum or concilium,” and added with regard to the papal nuncios: ‘I have no doubt but what your grace will take the measure of these men and will know well how to deal with them, for verily they are not to be trusted.’ Including himself among the Protestant princes, he then expressed the hope that the princes at Naumburg would unite together ‘in one religion and one mind,’ ‘a consummation,’ he added, ‘which would cause no slight annoyance to our adversaries, as your grace may easily imagine; for their strength lies chiefly in the fact that we are so divided against each other in religion.’¹

So double-tongued a man as this was not to be trusted either by Catholics or Protestants.²

When, in the same year, 1561, the Emperor brought forward the question of the election of a Roman king, the ecclesiastical electors insisted on being informed with certainty whether Maximilian, who was likely to be raised to the throne, was a good Catholic. Ferdinand communicated their wish to his son and requested him to say conscientiously what answer was to be given to the spiritual electors. Maximilian replied that it was ‘his firm resolve to maintain the Catholic religion, and to live and die in its faith.’ ‘What you say gives me great pleasure,’ Ferdinand went on, ‘and I verily

¹ In Le Bret, ix. 188, 190. The English ambassadors, Knolles and Mundt, wrote to Queen Elizabeth in 1562: ‘Maximilian bears himself so that the Protestants stand in good hope, the Papists do not despair, and he is liked by both’ (*Calendar of State Papers, For. Ser.* p. 552).

² This view of Janssen is supported by Paulus in the *Histor. Jahrbuch*, xvi. 600, against Hopfen.

believe that you will not wander away from the path of your ancestors ; I am also convinced that, if you were otherwise minded, you would not hide the fact from me for any consideration. The demand made by the ecclesiastical electors I hold to be perfectly legitimate, and I confess that without the assurance which you have given, neither for your sake, nor for all the kingdoms of the world, would I propose or support you as a candidate. Of that you may be certain. And I beseech you, before the negotiations begin, to open your heart to me freely and unreservedly, so that you may not afterwards bring yourself and your father to shame ; for unless you can give me full and positive asseveration in this respect, I shall not give you any support : on the contrary, I shall be the first to oppose you.' Once more Maximilian declared that the Emperor might rest assured that he would live and die a faithful son of the Roman Church, as his forefathers had done. He solemnly renewed this assurance in the presence of his brothers, and before the imperial privy councillors. He resumed attendance at Mass, and took part in processions and other Catholic Church services. He told Ferdinand that he had come to recognise how greatly the new religionists were going astray, and that he was sure the bulk of the people would return to the true fold, if the clergy ceased scandalising them by their evil examples. The only point on which he held out was the lay chalice.¹ And thus the court preacher Cittardus was able to give the ecclesiastical electors the most tranquillising assurances concerning Maximilian's future attitude. The Pro-

¹ Reimann, *Religiöse Entwicklung*, pp. 58-61. Ritter, i. 254. Götz, *Maximilian's Wahl*, pp. 118 f. See Hopfen, pp. 74 f.

testant friends of the King of Bohemia had no suspicion of his hypocrisy ; they cherished the hope that in Ferdinand's successor they would have a champion.¹

From the outset there had been no reason to fear any opposition to Maximilian's election from the Lutheran electors : Joachim II. of Brandenburg had himself suggested the King as a candidate ; Augustus of Saxony, when first the Emperor proposed his son's name, had declared that he should 'be on the imperial side.'² The Calvinist elector, Frederic III., on the other hand, spoke decidedly against proceeding with an election. He was only waiting for the throne to be vacant to 'ravish the Empire from the House of Austria.' It was said in Heidelberg that to prevent the Empire from losing 'its freedom,' it was desirable that the 'dignity should pass for once to another line.'³ Under the existing conditions of schism and embitterment between the Protestant and Catholic Estates, the election of an Emperor during an interregnum would in all probability have led to a rival election, which in its turn might have caused a civil war, in which there would have been danger of the interference of foreign powers.

¹ Schmidt, *Neucre Gesch.* ii. 151. Götz, *Maximilian's Wahl*, p. 119.

² Häberlin, iv. 483 ff.; Ritter, i. 252. Both these electors, be it said, demanded, later on, very real counter services in return for their votes, and their requests were for the most part granted. See Götz's *Maximilian's Wahl*, pp. 145 f., 191 f., a work based on the study of archives, and Walter's *Die Wahl Maximilian's II.*, a dissertation; Heidelberg, 1892. See also Schlecht, in the *Histor. Jahrbuch*, xiii. 903, and xiv. 185. In a hitherto unknown memorandum, preserved in the Berlin secret State archives (possibly the work of a Protestant in Maximilian's retinue) and intended as a propaganda for the election of Maximilian, the latter is recommended directly in opposition to papistical candidates. Altmann, in the *Mittheilungen des Oesterr. Instituts*, 1892, xiii. 619 ff.

³ Kluckhohn's *Briefe*, i. 243, 247 ff., 274, 286, 355. See Kluckhohn's *Friedrich der Fromme*, pp. 190-192, and Götz's *Maximilian's Wahl*, pp. 107 ff.

Christopher of Würtemberg put this probability before the Elector Palatine and reminded him of the responsibility he was incurring in opposing an election at the present time.¹ Finding no support among the other princes, Frederic withdrew his opposition, and on November 24, 1562, Maximilian was unanimously elected King of Rome at Frankfort on the Main, and crowned in St. Bartholomew's Church on November 30. After the manner of all his predecessors, he swore a solemn oath that he would maintain the Catholic religion, protect the Church and its ministers, and continue in dutiful submission and loyalty to the Pope and the Roman Church.²

How far Maximilian in his heart remained attached to the Augsburg Confession must be left undecided. Certain it is, however, that this many-faced and equivocating prince, guided not so much by conviction as by caprice and calculation, never planted his foot firmly on the soil of Roman Catholicism. His religious opinions were as misty and confused as possible, and this in itself was a sufficient reason for the failure of his attempt to reunite the schismatic parties ; his utterances were always such that they could be interpreted in a two-fold manner. Against Calvinism alone did he oppose a decided and straightforward front.³

¹ Häberlin, iv. 539-540. Götz's *Maximilian's Wahl*, pp. 109 and 139.

² Götz, *Maximilian's Wahl*, pp. 170 f., and the already cited work of Walter. That Pius IV. did not, as has so often been alleged against him, take up a position absolutely antagonistic to Maximilian's election, but that, on the contrary, he met the wishes of the Emperor and the King as far as he possibly could, is shown by Schlecht, in his most interesting and valuable article, 'Das geheime Dispensbreve Pius IV. für die römische Königskrönung Maximilian's II.' in the *Histor. Jahrbuch*, xiv. 1-38.

³ See Hopfen, pp. 90 ff. and Hirn, *l.c.* That Maximilian (as Paulus

Already, on the day of the election at Frankfort, Christopher of Würtemberg had endeavoured to persuade his Protestant associates, especially the Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, to unite in taking action with regard to Frederic III. He had urged on them that there was no doubt whatever that the Zwinglian or Calvinistic doctrine had gained the upper hand in the Palatinate, that it was a most pernicious heresy, that it stood in direct opposition to the Confession of Augsburg, and that ‘this sect, like all the others, was excluded from the Religious Peace.’ Over and above all this, he said, ‘Calvinism, as is proved by many examples, is seditious in spirit, and wherever it enters it is determined to usurp dominion, even over magistrates: the Elector Palatine is therefore exposed to danger not only from outside, but also from his own subjects.’ Christopher urged that the Estates ought all to join in representing this to the Elector and in endeavouring to make him see ‘what a mocker he would appear in everybody’s eyes’ if, after subscribing, only a short time ago, to the Augsburg Confession, both in the Frankfort Recess and at Naumburg, he so soon digressed from it. ‘It is also easy to foresee what misery, tribulation, and ruin your Grace will by this means bring on yourself, on your land, and on your people, seeing that the Religious Peace is based on the Confession of Augsburg.’¹

The Electors of Brandenburg and Saxony, however, would not accede to Christopher’s proposal, although in doing so they would have been supported by Maximilian. ‘The Roman King solemnly warned the Augs-

maintains in the *Histor. Jahrb.* xvi. 509) after his election was no longer Protestant at heart I am inclined to doubt.

¹ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 371-377.

burg Confessionists to beware of letting the Zwinglian or Calvinistic poison creep in among them; for otherwise the Religious Peace, which the Emperor had arranged in all sincerity after the recusation of the Council by the Evangelicals, would be frustrated, and this might lead to the complete ruin of the beloved Fatherland.¹ Soon afterwards Maximilian told Duke Christopher at Göppingen, that if the Protestant princes had not succeeded in settling their differences and becoming united by St John's day next year, it was quite likely that forcible proceedings of some sort would be taken against them.² Maximilian and Ferdinand implored the Elector Palatine most urgently, both in April and July 1563, to renounce Calvinism, which was excluded from the benefits of the Religious Peace.³ But neither Emperor nor King received a word of answer to their entreaties. When, in the following year, Christopher of Würtemberg and the Count Palatine Wolfgang of Zweibrücken begged the King to address 'another similar letter' to Frederic, Maximilian refused to try again, saying, with bitterest reproaches of the Elector for his apostasy, that he had not yet answered either his or his father's first remonstrances. He added, however, that he would consider by what means this grievous trouble might be remedied, and the matter suitably dealt with in accordance with the terms of the Religious Peace.

Maximilian commended both the princes for the rules and regulations which they had drawn up to protect their lands against 'the poison of the Palatinate,'

¹ *Eine Mainzer Aufzeichnung vom 27 November 1562*, from Habel's *Nachlass*.

² Heppe, *Gesch. des Protestantismus*, ii. 24. Kugler, ii. 436.

³ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 398-399, 419-422.

and promised to use his influence to persuade Ferdinand ‘to bestow like watchful care in preventing his lands and dominions from being corrupted by this same poison, so that by the joint efforts and careful scrutiny of the Emperor, himself, and the Estates of the realm, the evil leaven might at last be cleared out.’¹

Frederic of the Palatinate had no fears of such a scrutiny being instituted.

After the death of the Emperor Ferdinand, on July 25, 1564, and the accession of Maximilian, Frederic, in spite of his Calvinistic Heidelberg Catechism, presented himself to the new ruler as an adherent of the Augsburg Confession, and began instructing him in the duties of his office. His first and highest duty, he told him, was to acknowledge and propagate the one true Christian religion, which alone could procure salvation, and which was embodied in the Augsburg Confession, and to labour for the extirpation of the Catholic Church, or, as he put it, ‘the abolition of all idolatry and false worship.’ Maximilian must not let himself be hindered in this work by the wicked enemy, and by the Pope and all his followers. Frederic expressed his regrets that former emperors had not used their power and prerogative ‘against the abominable idolatry of the Roman antichristian Empire.’ There would doubtless be plenty of people who would counsel him, the Emperor, to ‘moderation in religious affairs;’ but he must not follow such advice; God Almighty wished that everything that was contrary to His command should be ‘hated, shunned, and abolished.’ In order to put an end to the quarrels and dissensions among the theologians, the Emperor, Frederic said, should summon a council and

¹ Kugler, ii. 455.

preside over it himself, and abolish ‘all in the constitution of the Empire which hindered the advent of the kingdom of God.’¹

In the Elector’s eyes the abolition of the ecclesiastical reservation would be the best means for ‘ridding the Empire of the horrors and idolatry of the papacy;’ and to this end (he wrote on August 22, 1564, to the Elector of Saxony) the three temporal electors must deliberate with other princes as to how the new Emperor was to be prevailed on to do away with this obstacle to the ‘emancipation of the true Christian religion.’²

Reckless of Emperor and Empire, Frederic went forward with his violent measures, not only against the Catholics and all their institutions, schools, and Church property, but also against the Lutherans. Even his own younger brother, the Count Palatine George, deemed it advisable that judgment should be pronounced on Frederic’s religious position by a declaration from all the other Protestant princes. The Count Palatine Wolfgang of Zweibrücken was in favour of this suggestion, ‘for by this means,’ he wrote to Duke Christopher of Würtemberg, ‘the Elector’s sect, and all belonging to it, will be condemned, and we and the others be cleared before God and the world.’ The civil authorities would also by this means come to a knowledge of what power and authority their offices conferred on them. Every prince of the Empire who made himself a partisan of this sect must ‘without mercy be excluded from the Religious Peace.’³

On August 24, 1565, Christopher once more summoned all the Lutheran princes to unite with him for

¹ Struve, pp. 145–149. ² Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 520. See i. 529–530.

³ Kugler, ii. 461.

the protection of the true faith against Zwinglianism, which in some parts of Germany was making violent inroads, in others creeping in secretly and insidiously. ‘People were more and more finding out what deadly poison and execrable blasphemy lurked in this doctrine, and it was to be feared that many more abortions would be generated by this monster, seeing that the Heidelbergers had not scrupled to write that Christ in the Sacrament was a wheaten idol, and in our hearts a mere fiction of man’s invention.’¹

Thus there was every reason to expect that at the Diet summoned by Maximilian to meet at Augsburg, ‘a heavy storm would burst on the head of the Elector of the Palatinate.’

¹ Neudecker, *Neue Beiträge*, ii. 89–96.

CHAPTER XVI

RELIGIOUS TRANSACTIONS AT THE DIET OF AUGSBURG IN
1566—WHETHER CALVINISM IS INCLUDED IN THE
RELIGIOUS PEACE ?

AMONG the subjects announced by the Emperor for discussion at the Diet of January 14, 1566, two principal ones were : how a right understanding was to be arrived at with regard to the Christian religion, and how the inroads of the heretical sects were to be stemmed.

Frederic III., to whom it could not be a matter of doubt whether Calvinism would be reckoned among the number of these ‘seductive sects,’ spared no pains before the meeting of the Diet in endeavouring to bring his Protestant compeers to a state of unanimity, and to prevail on them to oppose a united front to the Catholic Church. ‘It was not Protestantism,’ he explained to them, ‘which had produced all these erroneous sects ; they had originated from the blasphemies and idolatry of the papacy, which was the true source of all heresy : the first step, therefore, must be to abolish the papacy.’ So long as the papacy, with all its sacrilege and worship of idols, continued to exist in Germany, so long would sects of all sorts have the right to claim for themselves the same tolerance and recognition that Roman Catholicism enjoyed. The Protestant princes, who, in spite of all ‘secondary disputes’ among theologians, were really and truly united on all fundamental doctrine,

must stand loyally together, must encourage and strengthen the Emperor in his bias towards the true religion, and above all must lose no time in endeavouring to secure the abolition of the Ecclesiastical Reservation.¹

But the Protestant princes had very little hope of being able to combine unanimously against the papacy. The Landgrave Philip drew the Elector's attention to the controversy on the Person of Christ, and to the Palatine doctrine of the Sacrament which 'would cause a great deal of studying.' 'If we attempted to combat the papacy, we should be told that we were not agreed among ourselves.' 'Therefore, we do not really know what course will have to be taken in these matters. For it would look somewhat strange to be trying to reform others when we were divided among ourselves.' Philip promised, however, to exert influence at the Diet, through his councillors, for reducing the Estates to unanimity, and for procuring the abolition of the Reservation.² The Elector Augustus of Saxony feared that if stronger pressure than before was brought to bear in this matter, the result would be to upset the whole Religious Peace. He apprehended 'less harm and disaster' from the papacy than 'from the want of unity, the schisms, and the odious quarrelling of those who boasted of their adherence to the Augsburg Confession.' It was obvious from the situation of affairs, he wrote, with evident reference to Frederic's new confession of faith, 'that in these later times there had been no decrease of schism, errors, and perverting doctrine, but that, on the contrary, these evils had gone on in-

¹ Heppe, *Gesch. des Protestantismus*, ii. 113. Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 599-601.

² Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 609-610.

creasing; for so great was the mutual bitterness of heart and spirit that strife and division were preferred to peace and unity, and more delight was taken in setting up novel, independent creeds and dogmas than in the maintenance of the true Christian doctrine.¹ Augustus of Saxony, moreover, did not wish Frederic to 'be driven at the Diet to separation from the other Estates,' which would occasion a still greater breach in the Empire.² The Elector Joachim II. of Brandenburg, to whom Augustus caused this to be intimated, declared the Palatine doctrine of the Sacrament to be a far greater blasphemy than even the Zwinglian error: the Estates must on no account give their sanction to this heresy, as adherents of the Augsburg Confession, but must declare openly that on this point they were not in agreement with Frederic; at the same time he would not advise that 'any severe measures should be taken against him, although all *contraria docentes* were excluded from the Religious Peace.'³ Duke Wolfgang of Zweibrücken replied to the Elector Palatine's declaration that 'in the controversy between the Protestant Estates it was not a question of secondary or minor disputation, but of matters which concerned the honour of the Son of God and the groundwork of salvation; there could be no fellowship between the Christians and the holders of false opinions, and no real happiness or good would follow, if, in violation of their consciences, they joined together to oppose the papacy, boasting of unanimous belief in one and the same creed, while an opposite state of things was plainly apparent, and had been made

¹ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 611-613.

² *Instruction* to the Elector of Brandenburg, in Kluckhohn, ii. 1038-1039, note.

³ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, ii. 1039.

known to the world by printed pamphlets. All those who should thus show themselves in the light of sharers in opinions that were most highly condemned would be self-excluded from the Religious Peace.¹ Wolfgang sent this letter to Frederic's sons-in-law, the Dukes John Frederic and John William of Saxony, and received the following answer from John William : He abhorred 'that devilish Zwinglianism,' felt true Christian pity for his father-in-law, of whose conversion he had small hopes, and would not suffer him to cover this heresy with the mantle of the Augsburg Confession ; on the contrary, he would do everything in his power to suppress and extinguish it.² John Frederic's answer to Wolfgang's letter is not known, but he had already intimated to his father-in-law that if he did not renounce his errors he would go to the devil.²

Duke Christopher of Würtemberg entertained fears 'that schism would break out among the adherents of the Augsburg Confession ' at the Diet. The Emperor had, at any rate, made up his mind to ask the evangelical Estates whether they still considered the Elector at Heidelberg a member of their own religious profession, whether he was qualified to be included in the Religious Peace, and whether the Palatine Catechism and Frederic's Church regulations were in harmony with the Augsburg Confession ? To these questions not one of the evangelical princes, if put on his oath, would be able to answer anything but 'No.' Duke Christopher's theologians advised that he should endeavour to move the other Protestant princes to fulfil their duty with regard to Frederic, but that he should be careful withal not to load himself with the chief odium in the matter, and

¹ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 605-607.

² *Ibid.* i. 150.

not to give any loophole for its being said afterwards that he alone, or he first, occasioned a breach between the Estates. It would be better for him to let the Count Palatine Wolfgang, Duke John William, and the delegates from Pomerania, Mecklenburg, and a few of the towns, take the initiative.¹

The Diet was to begin on January 14, 1566; but the Emperor, who had arrived with a brilliant retinue, had to wait more than two months for the notables and the delegates. The opening of the assembly did not take place till March 23. In the imperial address, which was read by Duke Albert of Bavaria, the first and principal matter of business mentioned by the Emperor was the question of the Christian religion. All the turbulence and disaffection which had distracted Germany, he said, had been caused by the long and wearisome schism in religion, and the misery and tribulation in the Empire would have been far worse even but for the Religious Peace, which King Ferdinand and the Estates had brought about in the year 1555, between the princes of the old religion and those professing the Augsburg Confession. All the ways and means however, by which, after the conclusion of this peace, Ferdinand and the Estates had sought to reconcile the religious differences, had been doomed 'by the special judgment of God and by the force of circumstances' to remain fruitless. Nevertheless, at the last Diets held at Ratisbon and Augsburg, it had been resolved, and recorded in the Recesses, that the Religious Peace should continue valid even if religious unification were not effected. The present Emperor also had sworn

¹ Heppe, *Gesch. des Protestantismus*, ii. 114. Kugler, ii. 478-480.

at his coronation to stand faithfully by this treaty, and he would be as good as his word.

There was no allusion in the address to the announcement previously made by the Emperor in his letters of summons, respecting transactions for effecting unification in religion between the adherents of the ancient religion and the Augsburg Confessionists. But Maximilian had all the more strongly emphasised the fact that 'It was well-known to everybody that, since the conclusion of the Religious Peace, divisions of all sorts had occurred among those parties, whether Catholic or Protestant, to whom alone the treaty had reference,' that 'abominable sects, erroneous, pernicious, misleading doctrines' were springing up day by day, and gaining dominion more and more, to the terrible scandal and perplexity of many Christian hearts and minds. It was therefore indispensably necessary to devise pious, fitting, and adequate measures for getting rid of these sects, which were excluded from the Religious Peace. With fatherly solicitude and most earnest insistence, the Emperor begged the Estates to point out to him what these measures should be.¹

The Emperor had given up his earlier idea of negotiations between the Catholic princes and those of the Augsburg Confession on account of the daily widening breaches among the Protestants, and the sluggishness and unwillingness of the princes concerned,² and also in deference to Pope Pius V., who, through his legate, Cardinal Commendone, had most sternly forbidden him, even on pain of excommunication and dethronement, to meddle in any way with religious matters.³

¹ *Reichstagsacten*, 70 fol. 74-106. See Häberlin, vi. 145 ff.

² Hopfen, p. 131 f.

³ See Schwarz, *Briefe und Acten*, i. 3 f., 6 f., 16 f. Ritter i. 266,

The Emperor did not wish to break openly with the Church ; on the contrary, he made a parade of Catholic conformity. In the observance of the Mass and other ‘popish ceremonies,’ the Hessian ambassadors reported, Maximilian was as strict as his father. Moreover, he never heard any other sermons than those of his court preacher Cittardus, who was out and out ‘popish.’¹ On the other hand, in private conversations with Protestants, the Emperor made no secret of his constant predilection for the Augsburg Confession ; he spoke against the invocation of saints, called the Mass and Purgatory monkish dreams, and said it was a most heinous sin to bind consciences down to such things. To the Elector Augustus of Saxony he owned that he would prefer, now at once, to put an end to the whole idolatrous business.² While, however, he was thus inclining more and more to the Confession of Augsburg, Calvinism was as odious to him as ever. His court preacher delivered violent harangues against the Calvinistic doctrine of the Sacrament, which, according to the testimony of an ambassador from the Palatinate, he was wont to describe as a ‘damnable, heretical, blasphemous, seditious doctrine, cunningly devised according to human understanding and reason by self-instructed charlatans and quack theologians.’³

On March 29 it was resolved at the Diet that, for the avoidance of acrimony of any sort, ‘nothing should be decided with regard to religion in general assembly ;’

277. Hopfen, p. 131, shows that Maximilian II. endeavoured to nullify Commendone’s mission as long as it was possible.

¹ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 567, note.

² *Archiv für sächsische Geschichte*, iii. 335. Kluckhohn, *Friedrich der Fromme*, p. 222, and 464–465. See Hopfen, pp. 116 f., 132 f.

³ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 634.

but that the Catholic Estates should stand together ‘as one man,’ and the Estates of the Augsburg Confession likewise, and that each party should send up its grievances to the Emperor in writing.¹

Thereupon the Protestant princes and ambassadors (with the exception of the Palatine councillors) met together in the hostel of Elector Augustus of Saxony, and agreed that they could not be associated with Frederic III. of the Palatinate in religious matters unless he made an entirely satisfactory ‘Christian declaration, especially respecting the article of the Holy Sacrament.’² Frederic, however, who two days later, April 2, put in a personal appearance at the Diet, ignored this decision, and joined in the business of the assembly without making any declaration of his opinions. On April 12 he invited the Estates to his hostel, and on this day, and on April 13, at the hostel of the Elector Augustus, an agreement was arrived at concerning a petition to be sent to the Emperor. ‘Unanimously as one man,’ they said in this document, ‘they would oppose the idolatrous papists.’ What sort of unanimity, however, existed among them was made known by Duke Christopher and the Count Palatine Wolfgang on April 17, at a gathering of Protestant princes and delegates of princes, when he told them that the Elector Palatine’s chaplain had dared ‘here, while the Diet was sitting, to attack the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist with most offensive and scandalous language, and had openly called all believers in this dogma Capernaites, cannibals, and other abominable names.’³

¹ Donawer, p. 37.

² Kugler, ii. 483-484.

³ Report of the Hessian Ambassador of April 19, 1566, in Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 655. See Ritter, i. 279.

In a publication also circulated against Frederic by the Lutheran party, it was stated that ‘His preachers rant and declaim against us openly, call us eaters of the Lord God, Capernaites, cannibals.’ Frederic answered that abuse and invective of this sort was not carried on with his sanction, and that it was unreasonable to ‘call him to account for it, and make it a cause of separation.’ ‘On the other hand, it was well known how the preachers and scribes of that party dealt wholesale in abusive nicknames such as heretics, ranters, revilers of the Sacrament, devil’s teachers, and so forth, and that ‘those among them who excelled most in this practice were the most highly esteemed.’¹ Nevertheless, ‘however discordant they might be among themselves’ in their joint petition now, as before at Naumburg, the princes assumed the semblance of perfect unity in the faith. They heaped the heaviest accusations against the Catholic Church and against their Catholic brother princes.

It was not the Protestants, they declared, who had caused schism and sectarianism in religion; the evil had all arisen by divine decree, ‘out of the heathen atrocities and idolatry of the papacy.’ ‘Whereas for many years past they had observed, in many different transactions and in imperial edicts and declarations, evident signs of the Emperor’s sincere zeal for the true religion,’ they now proposed, in their anxiety both for his temporal and eternal welfare, and for the satisfaction of their consciences, to bring to his notice all that the extremity of the case required.

All God-fearing people, they said, not only in Germany but also in the neighbouring kingdoms, were

¹ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 728.

confident that at this present Diet the Emperor, in the present state of religious division, would find a way for the propagation of the Divine Word, by which the ‘idolatry and abominations’ of the Pope would be extirpated. The Emperor must be well informed, from trustworthy, historical sources, what was the origin of this papacy, which had come into existence, to the disturbance of the whole of Christendom ; he must be aware of the manner in which it had gradually weakened the imperial power, incensed the princes one against the other, fettered the emperors ‘by impious oaths,’ and introduced all sorts of idolatry into religion, above all the iniquitous Mass. All this had been demonstrated more than once by the writings of their theologians. It was only within the last forty years that the all-merciful God had had pity on His poor Church, and in a marvellous manner had rekindled in the German Empire the light of His unchangeable Word, which alone could give salvation, and had caused it to shine throughout Christendom. But the Popes and their followers had ‘set themselves stubbornly against this light,’ and in opposition to God and to their consciences had striven to suppress and extinguish it.’ The true doctrine was set forth clearly in the Augsburg Confession and the Apology. As for all the different sects, whose extirpation the Emperor demanded in his address, they knew of none such in their territories ; these must have originated with the wicked enemy and the papists, ‘who persecuted the manifest truth in violation of their consciences, and would not allow it place or foothold.’ To the Pope and his champions they could say, with equal truth, what Elias had said : ‘I have not troubled Israel, but thou and thy father’s

house, in that ye have forsaken the Commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim.'

All these charges against the Catholic Estates and the Catholics generally, as followers of idolatry, the Protestants were pleased to say had been made 'for the furtherance of God's glory, for the welfare of the Empire, and with a view to peace;' and what they had thus done in a 'Christian and loyal spirit' they expected the Emperor 'to respond to in a fatherly and gracious manner.' It was their hope and belief, they repeated, that in the loftiness of his understanding he would already have thought out ways and means by which the abominable idolatry and superstitions of the papacy might once for all be stopped. In their opinion the means best adapted to this end would be to convene a national council under the presidency of the Emperor.¹

'A council of this sort,' said the Catholic party, 'would be a veritable tower of Babel; for if even now, when there were only a few theologians and princes at work discussing religious matters, the Protestants were constantly at strife and divided by worse hatred than ever, what was likely to happen if crowds were assembled from all parts of Germany in order, as they said, to decide matters according to the Divine Word? Who at such a council would be judge and arbiter as to what was the true interpretation of the Divine Word and Holy Scripture, to which they all in turn appealed for justification of their endless different dogmas? There would be Lutherans of the unaltered Confession, and Lutherans of the altered Confession, Flacians, Hesshusians, Strigelians, Wigandists, Adiaphorists, Synergists, Majorites, Musculists, Osianderites, Schwenck-

¹ Donawer, pp. 47-82; Lehmann, pp. 90-103.

feldians, and by whatever other names these teachers of the different doctrines called themselves; not to speak of Zwinglians and Calvinists and the new sect of Ubiquists, who all and sundry condemned each other as heretics, and, as everybody knows, in their writings sent each other to the devil.' And if the Emperor were to lay down the law, who would obey him ? And which of the princes would have power 'to legislate beyond the limits of his own territory ? There is scarcely one of these who has any control over his own theologians, as the princes themselves confess. Who would be able to exercise authority over the imperial cities ? And let no one imagine that these towns would go along with the princes in their confession of faith. In these questions of religion there are innumerable splits and differences of opinion, and whichever way one turns there is nothing but discontent, mistrust, quarrelling and hatred, a very Babel indeed, which at a national council would be evident to the blindest ; indeed, the Confessionists, when among themselves, do not deny that all this is true. But in the eyes of the world they pose as if they were eager for a council.'¹

The petition of the Protestant Estates went on to supplicate that, 'meanwhile, until a national council should be summoned, the Emperor would, in the first place, grant free exercise of their religion to all subjects of Catholic princes who either were, or should become, adherents of the Augsburg Confession, and, secondly, that he would remove the Ecclesiastical Reservation.'

The Elector Frederic had for a long time pointed out

¹ *Tractat über die rechte und einig christliche Schlichtung der Streithändel in Sachen christliches Glaubens und Confession* (1566), pp. 4-5.

to the Protestant Estates that the abolition of the Reservation was the best means towards the extirpation of the Catholic religion.¹ The suppliants, in their petition, called this article ‘the mainspring of all the pernicious mistrust’ existing between the Estates of the German nation. ‘We cannot,’ they protested, ‘allow this eternal blemish and disgrace to rest on our true religion; we are furthermore of opinion that the said article is a heavy burden on the consciences even of many loyal Estates of the ancient religion, and that your Majesty is bound in the sight of God to allow free course to the truth of God, which alone can give salvation; and that you ought not to bar the way of salvation to any of your Estates or subjects.’

The Protestant towns, however, did not believe that the princes, ‘in their continual agitation’ for the abolition of the Ecclesiastical Reservation, ‘were guided by considerations of eternal salvation.’ If, at the Diet of 1559, some at least of the towns had joined the princes, these also now changed their opinions. When the princes pressed the town delegates to vote for the removal of the Reservation, the latter were unanimous in their refusal, and, as the Frankfort delegates reported on April 23, ‘placed themselves thus under the high disfavour of electors and princes.’² ‘All the imperial cities, without exception,’ wrote Christopher of Württemberg, ‘have now deserted us on the matter of emancipation. Had they stood loyally by the princes, I believe the measure would have been forced on the Emperor: he no longer felt much pleasure, therefore, in joining in transactions respecting religion with an imperial city.’³

¹ See above, pp. 342 f.

² *Frankfurter Reichstagsacten*, 70, fol. 22.

³ Kugler, ii. 493.

In spite of the contrariety of the towns, the petition and gravamina were sent up to the Emperor, through the Elector of Saxony, on April 25, in the name of all the Estates belonging to the Augsburg Confession.

Maximilian, according to the agreement made by both parties, handed it to the Catholic Estates to be answered. Their reply was couched in calm and temperate language, differing very agreeably from the bitter polemical style of the adversaries : ‘They had no desire on their part,’ they said, to enter afresh on a dispute of so many years’ standing, which had been worn threadbare, and the story of which had filled such innumerable books ; nor did they intend to indulge in a cross-fire of ratiocination and in reciprocation of the slanderous libels and insults, so odious to a Christian spirit, which were hurled at them in the petition. They had come to Augsburg with the intention of seeking out ways and means by which, in these parlous times of extreme peril to the German nation, peace, tranquillity, and security might be restored. All the more strange, therefore, did it seem to them that, contrary to all the usages of the holy Empire, in violation of the Religious Peace, and in opposition to all Christian rule and courtesy, they should be met with so virulent and slanderous a document : a document which dared in the grossest manner to attack the ancient Catholic religion handed down from the days of the Apostles, the Majesty of the Emperor himself, the Catholic Estates of the realm, and even the pious forefathers of the petitioners themselves (the Augsburg Confessionists) who had died in the Catholic religion. They could not believe that the petition really emanated from these Estates ; they preferred to think it was the work of

restless agitators who delighted in stirring up sedition with their pens, and whose last wish or thought was to establish and maintain between Emperor and Estates the peace that was of such vital import to the nation. No greater insult or injury could be inflicted on them than to be told publicly that their religion was blindness ; that their religion was a scandalous abomination, a heathen invention, an idolatrous system, altogether at variance with the Word of God ; that the regular authority of the Church and the Councils was tyranny ; that they and other Catholics were in opposition to the Word of God, were the cause of all the irregularities and sectarianism in the Church, and that they were unmindful of the welfare of the German nation.' They then proceeded to refute the reproaches and complaints raised against the Church. ' If the old religion was no longer of any account, and if it was indeed true that it was only in these later times that the Omnipotent God had taken pity on His poor Church, and that not till some short forty years ago had He vouchsafed to kindle in the holy German Empire the marvellous light of the one only Gospel by which salvation is wrought, and allow it to shine throughout Christendom ; how incredibly great must have been the wrath of Almighty God, even after the human race had been redeemed at such tremendous cost, and had received the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, if He could keep back such a light from the Christian Church and from our pious forefathers, and leave them groping in the darkness and the shadow of death, and allow so many hundred thousands of souls, baptised in His own name, to perish in corruption and eternal damnation.' As to fresh religious conferences, or a national council, they could not recommend either

of these ways to the Emperor. Conferences had always proved fruitless, and a national council would not heal the schism in religion ; on the contrary, it would only lead to fresh anarchy and apostasy among Christian nations. If, however, the Emperor should be able to suggest any practicable and salutary measures for the solution of the difficulty, be it Christian reform of Church discipline, or removal of many palpable scandals, grievances, and irregularities, or any other means which accorded, at any rate, with the substance of Catholic doctrine and the decrees of the Council lately held at Trent, they, on their part, would not be found wanting in zeal for the re-establishment of unity and the maintenance of peace.

With regard to the complaints raised by the Protestant Estates of injury and oppression practised against their fellow-believers, they themselves had far greater and more numerous grievances to bring forward : it would seem indeed as if the one concern of the Protestants was to get possession of the last remnants and fragments of the churches, abbeys, and cloisters, with all the goods appertaining to them, in spite of the terms of the Pacification of Augsburg, by which all these had been so dearly secured to the Catholics. As to their demand for the abolition of the Ecclesiastical Reservation, and the guarantee of religious freedom to their subjects, they must at all points conform rigidly to the letter of the Pacification of Augsburg. Unconditional freedom of religion was by no means, in their opinion, conducive to general peace, because it gave wide scope to seditious, insubordinate, disloyal subjects—Anabaptists, Sacramentarians, and other similar sects—to set themselves up insolently over the civil rulers, to foment insurrection

and turbulence, and then, by appeal to the Augsburg Confession, to evade their merited punishment. With regard to the heretical sects alluded to by the Augsburg Confessionists, they could only reiterate that the benefits of the Religious Peace extended to no other religion save that of the Catholic Church and the Confession of Augsburg ; all other sects were entirely excluded. If, now, in the ancient, universal Church, nobody was tolerated who did not conform to its faith and sacraments, it followed that there could be no sects in this Church, and they could only exist there where, from all pulpits and in all new publications, the ancient Catholic religion was anathematised. They therefore begged the Emperor to demand from the Estates of the Augsburg Confession a clear declaration of their meaning.¹

Meanwhile Maximilian had been besieged with vehement complaints against Frederic III., not only from the Bishop of Worms, but also from the Protestant Estates. The Bishop of Worms and the abbeys of Neuhausen and Sinsheim complained that the Elector had invaded their rights and liberties, in violation of the Religious Peace, and had mutilated, torn down, and taken away altars, images, books, jewels, and other things. On the Lutheran side, the Margrave Philibert of Baden, and the knights, councillors, and burghers of Oppenheim came forward to complain of Frederic's unlawful, violent suppression of the Augsburg Confession, of his iconoclasm, and of his introduction of the Calvinist religion.²

Maximilian handed over the petitions of grievances

¹ Donawer, pp. 128–151 ; Lehmann, pp. 103–112.

² See above, p. 321–322.

to a committee of the Estates for their opinion on them, and after judgment had been pronounced on May 10 the Emperor, in accordance with the decision of the committee, issued a severe edict against Frederic on May 14. With regard to his offences against the Bishop of Worms and the abbeys of Neuhausen and Sinsheim, the sentence was the same that had already been passed on him by Maximilian (though without any result), viz. full restitution and indemnity for damages. He was also required to make amends and reparation to the Margrave of Baden. And, furthermore, he was to recant all that he had pledged himself to in Calvinism, both as regards doctrine and the administration of the Sacraments ; to dismiss all preachers and schoolmasters who clung obstinately to Calvinistic tenets, and to suppress the Heidelberg Catechism and other Calvinistic books. If he did not obey all these orders, but continued himself, and allowed his subjects to continue, in adherence to Calvinist error, the Emperor, it was stated, 'would not be able to have patience with him any longer, but would be compelled, in fulfilment of the terms of the Religious Peace, to take serious steps in the matter.¹

Frederic did not allow himself to be disconcerted. 'The Emperor,' he said, on hearing the edict read, 'may carry on his "execution" against the Turks, but I dare any one to come near me with an execution !'² No whit daunted, he went on, as before, openly denouncing the Catholic religion as 'idolatry.' His proceedings in the abbeys of Neuhausen and Sinsheim, he declared, were quite in order. It was incumbent on

¹ Struve, pp. 184 f.

² *Mainzische Aufzeichnung*, see above, p. 123, note 3.

him as a Christian magistrate to proclaim and propagate the pure teaching of the Gospel, and to root out all that remained in the land of popish superstition and idolatry, and to organise Christian reforms and institutions.¹ He considered it specially insulting to him that the contents of the edict should have been communicated to him not only in the presence of the princes of the Augsburg Confession, but also 'of the clergy, especially of such of the species who wore red birettas, such as the Cardinal of Augsburg and other popish rabble.' He declared before a group of electors and princes gathered round the Emperor on May 14, that in matters of conscience he recognised no other lord than God Almighty. He knew nothing of Calvinism, he said ; he took his stand on the Frankfort Recess and the Confession signed at Naumburg ; his Catechism was so well fortified with fundamental teaching of Scripture that hitherto nothing had overthrown it; but if anybody, from the meanest kitchen or stable boy to the Emperor himself, could teach him a better one out of the Holy Scriptures, he would yield willing obedience ; a Bible could easily be produced for the purpose.² When the Cardinal-bishop Otto of Augsburg reproached him with having said in his Catechism that the Holy Mass was detestable idolatry, Frederic acknowledged that he had done so.

¹ Meichsen's *Bericht*, in Senckenberg, *Collection of rare and unprinted MSS.*, i. 313-315.

² Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 312-315. Struve, pp. 187 ff. The usual tale that Frederic, after hearing the imperial edict, retired from the presence of the assembly, and then, after his son Casimir had brought him a Bible, came back again, is unhistorical and a later dressing-up of the incident. See Kluckhohn, i. 662, where it is also stated that the Elector Augustus of Saxony did not speak the words so often quoted : 'Fritz, you are more pious than all of us.'

The Elector was certain of the issue of his cause, for he was aware both of the Emperor's weakness and the powerlessness of the Catholic Estates, and he knew also how extremely bitter the Protestant Estates were against the Catholics. 'They will not condemn me,' he said, 'for fear of giving pleasure to the Catholics by so doing, and thus cutting off their own noses.'¹

A publication which appeared under the title, 'Christliches Bedenken, wie im römischen Reich und in der ganzen Kirche mit Gottes Hülfe Irrthum in der Religion abgeschafft und Einigkeit erhalten werden möchte,'² was not only sold publicly, 'but also dedicated to the laudable Estates, and presentation copies were given in some hostels.' The sum and substance of this treatise was that 'there would be no rest or unity for the Church until the papacy was rooted out.'³

The duplicity of the Elector Augustus of Saxony was the chief factor in extricating Frederic from his precarious situation.

Augustus had signified his full approval of the imperial edict of May 14, and had also agreed that it involved Frederic's 'condemnation and execution.' But he had immediately afterwards taken his departure from Augsburg, leaving no definite instructions for the further action of his councillors who remained behind.⁴

¹ *Mainzische Aufzeichnung*. See above, p. 123, note 3.

² 'Christian Advice how, with God's Help, to abolish Religious Heresy throughout the Roman Empire and the whole Church, and to maintain Unity of Faith' [Translator].

³ Erstenberger, p. 118.

⁴ In a despatch of May 22, 1566, he justified himself to the Emperor for his departure by saying that after the forenoon of the 14th, after he had expressed his opinion to the Emperor by word of mouth, and his Majesty 'had been satisfied with it, he had not expected any further deliberation on this point,' and had therefore not left his delegates any

These councillors, among whom were the secret Calvinists Craco and Lindemann, took an early opportunity of declaring for Frederic. On May 17 the Emperor summoned them into his presence, in company with the delegates who represented the Elector of Brandenburg, the Count Palatine of Zweibrücken, the Dukes of Würtemberg and Mecklenburg, and the Margrave of Baden, and had explained to them how matters stood with regard to the Elector of the Palatinate, reminding them of the growth of sectarianism in his territory. The Elector, he said, would not allow that these sects were in error, but had appealed in self-defence to the Augsburg Confession, albeit with the proviso 'as far as it conformed to the Holy Scriptures.' In order, therefore, to put down these sects and to check the evil in time, the Emperor, for guidance in his proceedings, desired to be informed whether they (the councillors and delegates) recognised the Elector as an adherent of the Augsburg Confession, and considered his religion in agreement with this confession as it stood in its original form. The councillors of the Elector of Saxony answered that, as they had no instructions on the matter, they must refer to their lord for his opinion. In view of the importance of the matter they would like also to consult with the absent Estates belonging to the Augsburg Confession. The princes agreed with

further instructions. In other words, says Ritter (i. 284, where this despatch is quoted from the Dresden State archives): 'He had voted for the decree against Calvinism because the Emperor wished it; but now the Emperor himself must see to the execution of his orders; he had not given his delegates any special instructions, but now that these latter were facing an imperial order so full of consequences they acted on the knowledge they had long possessed of this lord's real wishes, that the Elector Palatine should not be formally excluded from the Augsburg Confession and the Religious Peace.'

the councillors and begged the Emperor to grant them a short respite, promising to bring him their joint answer the next day. Maximilian assented to this request, remarking, however, that the affair was urgent, because the Elector Frederic was on the point of departure, and the business must be finally settled at this Diet, ‘in order that the poison might not spread further, for there were many other Estates in secret adherence to this sect, who were only waiting to see what would be decided at the Diet.’¹

‘We have no doubt whatever,’ wrote the delegates of the Saxon Elector to their lord, ‘that these troubles originate with the papists.’ They are ‘great and important matters.’ If they answered the Emperor’s question in the affirmative, they said, they should bring on themselves the suspicion of Zwinglianism. If they answered in the negative it would be condemning themselves and excluding themselves from the Religious Peace; it would lead to division among the Estates professing the Augsburg Confession, and would aggravate the persecution of foreign Protestants. They decided that their best course would be to propose to the Emperor that the case of the Elector Frederic should be subjected to ‘thorough discussion’ at a fresh convention; if then Augustus should not wish for the convention he could easily put difficulties in the way and prevent its coming off, if he thought fit.² Frederic himself was anxious for a convention as proposed, for ‘an impartial council or colloquy;’ he threatened that if his doctrine ‘was condemned without a hearing, or if

¹ Report of the Saxon councillors in Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 668–669. See ii. 1041–1042. Donawer, pp. 93–94.

² Kluckhohn, i. 669 ff.

any force was used against him, he would resort to all possible means of resistance at his disposal, and proceed as he thought fit.¹ ‘The Elector Palatine,’ so the Frankfort delegates reported, ‘is not to be daunted in this matter; he has Calvinist sermons preached publicly in his hostel every week, and there is always a very large attendance.’²

In the transactions which now followed, the Princes of Würtemberg, Zweibrücken, and Mecklenburg appeared as opponents of Frederic; they declared that, on the ground of the article respecting the Sacrament, they could not recognise the Elector Palatine as a brother in the faith.³

The councillors of the Elector of Saxony remained on Frederic’s side, and they were supported by the Hessian delegates and a few others. They argued that it might happen in future to many other of the Estates to be excluded from the benefits of the Religious Peace on account of disagreement respecting single articles, and that they ought to beware of playing into the hands of the papists. A Confession, in the form of articles and counter-articles, and furnished with arguments against Calvin, was drawn up by the Princes of Würtemberg, Zweibrücken, and Mecklenburg; but because ‘ubiquity and transubstantiation and other things had been introduced in it,’ the councillors of the Elector of Saxony would not assent to it, and again many ‘voted with them.’ ‘After much fierce discussion,’ the following declaration was addressed to the Emperor: ‘The Estates considered that Frede ic

¹ Donawer, pp. 94–96.

² *Reichstagsacten*, 70, fol. 59.

³ See Ritter, i. 285, who made use of a report of the electorate of Brandenburg in the State archives at Berlin.

was orthodox on the principal article of all-saving justification, and also on many other articles, but with regard to the article on the Sacrament they could not come to a unanimous decision. At the same time it was not their intention to allow either the Elector or others, whether Germans or foreigners, who should differ from them in some particular points, to be exposed to any danger, still less to be excluded from the Religious Peace. Frederic had expressed himself ready to defend his case, at a properly constituted assembly, by reference to the Word of God, and they would make arrangements with him for such a meeting during the present Diet.

The Emperor laid the chief blame of this turn of affairs on the Elector of Saxony's councillor, Linde mann. This man, he wrote to Duke Albert at Munich, had spoilt everything in this matter with the Elector Palatine : 'he has gone straight against everything that all the Estates had promised me before ;' if this could have been foreseen, it would have been a thousand times better, he said, to have left the matter alone. 'In short, there is no constancy among them. Doctor Lindemann is out and out "Palatine" and Zwinglian. I believe it is the devil who has brought him to this state of mind, and I am quite convinced that it will not be pleasing to the pious Elector of Saxony.'¹ But the Elector Augustus left his councillors a tolerably free hand, although their policy was opposed to that exhibited by himself at the Diet.² Under his 'tacit concurrence all the assaults on Frederic resulted in nothing.'³

¹ *Briefwechsel Maximilians*, p. 149. Kluckhohn, *Friedrich der Fromme*, p. 247.

² See Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, ii. 1041-1042.

³ Ritter, i. 286.

The imperial councillor Zasius, on May 17, begged the Bavarian Duke, at whose court Augustus was on a visit, to try to influence the Elector of Saxony not to let his councillors depart from the sentiments which he himself ‘had so wisely and piously, so justly, generously, and commendably expressed.’ Much depended on their votes. Everything now turned on the ‘straight-forward, prompt settlement of this business.’ The Emperor would then pluck up heart and courage to persevere in his good intentions; ‘otherwise it would have been far better (as the Emperor had said) to have left the matter alone, and stood by, dissembling, until in a few years Calvinism had conquered the whole German nation, as it had conquered some of the best minds already.’ In order to increase the difficulty they now alleged that ‘if it was decided to exclude the Elector Frederic from the Pacification of Augsburg, or if a declaration should follow, ‘the persecuted Christians in France or in the Netherlands might suffer worse treatment than before. This, however, was mere sophistry. Moreover, all the Protestants in those countries were Huguenots, and coarse, abominable Sacramentarians.¹ On May 18 Zasius wrote further that on May 15, the day after the issue of the imperial edict, Frederic’s preacher delivered a most ‘insolent’ sermon, anathematising both the papacy and the Confession of Augsburg. And yet the princes who professed belief in this creed could not bring themselves to exclude Frederic from their number.

¹ ‘Ergo reducantur in viam vel sint nobis ethnici et tanquam publicani.’ In Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 665–667. Zasius was the writer of this letter; see v. Bezold, *Briefe Casimir’s*, i. 9, note 1. For the passage on the Huguenots, see Sybel’s *Histor. Zeitschrift*, xix. 78, note.

‘For, as far as I can make out, they are determined not to snare the fox, in spite of all the insults and invectives which the Palatine preacher incessantly hurls at them and at the Confession. I greatly fear that this Diet will do more to strengthen and spread Zwinglianism than anybody thinks at present. And this will no doubt put the finishing stroke to the ruin of Germany. For the spirit of Calvinism is such that, in all its schemes and exertions, it aims at nothing but murder and bloodshed. France is an illustration of this. I greatly fear that they will gain the upper hand everywhere, and that the Augsburg Confessionists themselves in their own churches will not be safe from their attacks ; for examples are not wanting of heresies which led to murder and bloodshed during sermons and divine worship. May God preserve us from evil and from the dominion of the bloodthirsty bread-breakers.’¹ Later on the Lutheran theologians expressed the same fears as Zasius. ‘The Hunnish or Calvinistic, and also thoroughly Jewish and Calvinistic spirit,’ wrote Samuel Huber for instance, ‘is never at rest or satisfied unless it is gloating over our own and our children’s blood, and devastating the face of the whole earth.’²

In answer to the declaration addressed to him by the Protestant princes on May 22, the Emperor said that the Religious Peace had only been concluded between the Estates of the old religion and those who had subscribed to the Augsburg Confession ; by the exclusion of all other sects and opinions, both parties had hoped to secure the Empire against further religious disturbances. It was the bounden duty of the Emperor

¹ Kluckhohn, *Friedrich der Fromme*, 466-467.

² *Rettung &c.*, Vorrede, A^{3b}. See Celestinus, *Prüfung*, F²⁻³.

to conform to the terms of this treaty of peace. With regard to the Elector Frederic, he said, he was as much at a loss how to reconcile this present declaration of the Estates with the edict of May 14, which had been drawn up according to the advice and with the unanimous consent of all the princes assembled at the Diet, as with the private communications, both written and verbal, of the said princes. Neither before God nor before the world would it be justifiable to include in the benefits of the Peace all, without distinction, whether or no they agreed about all the articles of the Confession ; to extend this mantle of protection even over those who denied some of the most vital points in the creed, as for instance the doctrine of the Sacrament ; and to include foreign nations also, and thereby afford them scope for the propagation of all their different sects and opinions. He could not see what sense there was in the Augsburg Confession if no persons, whatever the sect they belonged to, should be required to give account of their opinions. There had never been any sect, ever since the days of the Apostles, that had not been in agreement with the universal Church on some, or indeed on most, points of the faith. Even at the present time, all the leading sects—even the Anabaptists—agreed with the Catholic Church and the Augsburg Confession in some articles, and each and all of them appealed equally to the Word of God. But if all sects were to be tolerated on account of their soundness on some points, he was at a loss to see how the holy Empire and the German nation could any longer maintain their existence. With regard to Frederic, the edict which had been drawn up in the presence and with the assent of the electors and princes must be

carried out. If Frederic would submit to being ‘directed and guided by them in religion’ they should at once begin to instruct him in such a manner that ‘he would acknowledge, not with his lips only, but with facts, the Augsburg Confession, and the whole of its doctrine, ceremonies, and Church usages,’ and in proof of his sincerity would renounce and abolish in his land all Calvinistic doctrines and institutions opposed to the Confession. In case, however, of the Elector’s refusing their instruction and guidance, and persisting in his erroneous views, the Emperor would then require of them a statement of opinion as to what steps were to be taken.¹

During the debates which then followed among the Protestant Estates, Duke Christopher and the Count Palatine Wolfgang once more insisted that a form of confession should be presented to Frederic, and that he and his theologians should be required to submit to the judgment which should be pronounced at the convention about to be summoned. The councillors of the electorate of Brandenburg and a few other delegates supported this opinion. But the majority voted on the side of the Elector of Saxony’s councillors, who maintained that to present a form of confession to Frederic would only cause fresh disputes and divisions; as for the convention, its constitution ought to be well planned, and submission to its decision was improbable; the Estates should ‘depute their political councillors to meet together at a fixed place, in order to consult as to whether and how such a convention should be assembled, and what should be the form of procedure, since in such a matter as the one in question the outward form was quite as important as the substance itself.’

¹ Donawer, pp. 108-109.

The Elector should simply be seriously admonished that his doctrine of the Sacrament was erroneous, and be required to recant it, ‘or else submit to having the truth demonstrated to him from the Word of God at an approved meeting.’ By the desire and in the presence of the Estates the Elector of Saxony’s counsellors then represented to the Elector Palatine that his views on the Sacrament were erroneous, and that by persisting in them he would cause much division among the Estates, much scandal in the Churches, much danger and misery to his country and among his people, especially as his preachers and theologians spoke much more recklessly and offensively about the Real Presence, in churches and schools, and even at this very Diet, than Calvin and Ecolampadius. The Elector was further reminded that on the matter of baptism also he was at variance with the Estates adhering to the Augsburg Confession. He had expelled from the country all preachers who did not agree with his doctrine, and he had forbidden his subjects to receive the Sacrament, or to have their children baptised, in the neighbouring principalities where the Augsburg Confession was conformed to. He was now required to make recantation, or at any rate, pending the approaching convention, to inhibit his theologians from further writing and preaching, and to cancel the religious prohibitions to his subjects.¹

Frederic, however, only reiterated that he was not conscious of believing any false doctrine; on the contrary, his opinions coincided with the Confession of Augsburg; if a convention were really held, his theologians would know how to defend themselves; in

¹ Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, i. 676–681.

his own principality he allowed no one to dictate to him.

‘From this heated discussion,’ it is said in a report, ‘distress and confusion arose. The final decision arrived at was that they must consult further with the councillors and electors respecting the idea of a convention.’¹

These further deliberations took place on May 24. On the same day Frederic left the Diet. He could travel, he knew, in perfect security, for the Estates had made known to him the contents of a document which they had drawn up for the Emperor in answer to the latter’s resolution of May 22.

This important document ran as follows: ‘They would not agree to a general condemnation of those persons, whether in German or in foreign lands, who were at variance with them respecting some few articles, even though they should be forced to allow that the said persons were themselves Calvinists, or had Calvinist teachers in their employment. For by so doing they would only be encouraging persecution, or even incurring the danger of being, sooner or later, forced to accept the doctrine of transubstantiation. To help in the extension of the papacy was by no means their wish or intention. As for the edict of May 14, in the publication of which only a few of them had taken part, they could not recognise it as applying to all the Estates, nor could they regard it as authorising the exclusion of Frederic from the Religious Peace; but only as a warning and admonition to him to renounce Calvinism. Finally, as Frederic had agreed to appear before a convention, the issue of which they must now await,

¹ Report in Donawer, pp. 110–112.

they could not settle beforehand what ought to be done in case of his not submitting to the decision ; the Emperor was advised to set this matter at rest, to postpone and to drop it.'¹

The Emperor spoke with great bitterness of the Protestant Estates, and was very angry at the fickleness shown by them in the Palatine case. He wrote to Duke Albert on May 24 that there was no reliance to be placed on these wavering, inconstant people. It was well, however, he added, that this had happened, 'for I have now learnt what sort of constancy I may expect from them. May God grant them a better spirit ! I would not give a brass farthing for their Confession ; for, as things are going on, we shall soon have universal Zwinglianism and confusion. I pray God that He vouchsafe to inspire them with a better mind ; but they are utterly blinded.' 'All the same,' he added, 'I cannot refrain from saying that Mecklenburg has come out very well in the business, and has stood his ground firmly. But that fellow Lindemann is a scoundrel to the backbone.'²

But Maximilian could not thwart and oppose these 'wavering, inconstant people' with firmness and decision, because he needed their subsidies for resistance to the ever increasing inroads of the Turks. He answered the document of the Estates as follows : 'In asking them for a statement of opinion, he had not meant them to proceed to business as if "the Elector Palatine alone was involved," or as if "there were any special animus against him ;" what had been much

¹ Donawer, pp. 112-117.

² *Briefwechsel*, p. 150. Kluckhohn, *Friedrich der Fromme*, p. 255. See Hopfen, p. 133.

more in his mind was that measures should be taken to purge the German Empire from the corruption of all those terrible foreign and native sects, which were becoming more and more numerous every day, and gaining greater and greater ascendency, at risk of completely ruining the country. Religious matters must be regulated in accordance with the Religious Peace of Augsburg, and the exclusion of the sects from the protection of this treaty must be insisted on.¹ In short, the edict issued against Frederic on May 14 must be carried out.¹

But ‘the Palatine affair grew and multiplied at the Diet in decrees, promises, debates, and words, and nothing practical was effected.’ Even the sequestration of the abbeys of Sinsheim and Neuhausen, confiscated by Frederic—an act which all the joint Estates had approved of—was not carried out. The proposed religious convention also, at which Frederic was ‘to allow himself to be set right by the Word of God,’ did not come to pass. The Elector was left free to carry on the extension of Calvinism, unhindered by the Emperor or the Empire.

As the imperial councillor Zasius had predicted, the result of the Diet was a general reinforcement of Calvinism throughout Germany²—not, however, till after one last protest had been made in the shape of ‘a Lutheran revolt which was defeated in Saxony by the Lutherans themselves.’

¹ Donawer, pp. 117–121.

² Hesshus gave expression to the same apprehension on May 8, in a letter to Chemnitz: ‘After this Diet Calvinism will advance rapidly.’ Leuckfeld, *Hist. Hesshus.* pp. 70–71.

CHAPTER XVII

THE GRUMBACH-GOTHA CONSPIRACY—A LUTHERAN
EMPIRE PROJECTED

TOWARDS the close of the Augsburg Diet of 1566, the Frankfort delegates wrote as follows respecting the transactions with the Elector Frederic on religious matters: ‘Would God we might establish genuine peace in Germany! We fear that a great storm is gathering in the heavens: may God Almighty graciously deign to disperse it!’¹

A ‘great storm’ had indeed long been brewing in the heavens.

Between the courts at Weimar and at Dresden serious enmity had broken out. Duke John Frederic the Second (*der Mittlere*) was not only ambitious to restore the vanished lustre of the Ernestine house by the reconquest of his electoral dignity and lands, but he also aimed, with the help of the nobility, at overthrowing the constitution of the Empire, placing himself on the imperial throne, and then, ‘in the character of a second Theodosius,’ establishing pure Lutheranism as the one religion in the Empire.

In this comprehensive undertaking he and his accomplice, the chancellor Christian Brück, were directed by the Knight William of Grumbach.

A worthy associate of the murderer and incendiary

¹ *Reichstagsacten*, 70, fol. 65.

Albert Alcibiades of Anspach-Culmbach, Grumbach also had known how to turn the fortune of war to his own profit in spoil of lands and money, at the expense of his feudal lord, the Bishop of Würzburg; but after the defeat of Albert in the year 1554, he had lost all his booty, and also his hereditary lands in the territory of the Bishop. He had succeeded in obtaining from the Imperial Chamber a mandate of restitution, which, however, Melchior Zobel, Bishop of Würzburg, had opposed. He denounced Grumbach as ‘a notorious malefactor,’ who did not even deserve a legal hearing, still less to be reinstated in his possessions; he called him ‘a perjurer and a violator of oaths, who had no longer any claim on justice.’¹ A fierce cross-fire of invective was carried on, and in February 1558 Grumbach declared that if his property was kept back from him any longer he should find himself compelled ‘to think of other means’ by which he might regain possession of it.² ‘The priests do nothing except under compulsion,’ the chancellor of the Margrave Albert had once written; ‘but if you put the thumbscrew on, then you get more out of them than you at first demanded.’³ It was on this advice that Grumbach intended acting. His hatred of the Bishop of Würzburg was ‘so bitter,’ he said, ‘that if he could tear his heart out of his body, he would not fail to do it.’⁴ In 1557 Duke John Frederic had made him a member of his privy council and granted him a letter of protection,⁵ and on the strength of these marks of favour Grumbach pushed vigorously on, and, as he put it, had determined to entertain

¹ Voigt, Grumbach, *Abhandl.* i. 136. Beck, i. 422.

² Voigt, p. 175.

³ Beck, i. 416.

⁴ Gropp, i. 678.

⁵ Beck, i. 432.

Germany with ‘a dance of the priesthood’ such as the latest books of history would chronicle; and if, he said, ‘the most excellent nobility throughout the Empire thereby came to their rights, so much the better would it be; and the downfall of the noble Francis of Sickengen, that highest example of all knightly deeds and virtues, would then be avenged in salt and blood.’ It was utterly in vain that the Emperor Ferdinand required Duke John Frederic to deliver up ‘this perturber of the public peace.’¹

Grumbach’s first intention was to seize the person of the Bishop of Würzburg. After a consultation at Coburg he despatched several of his staunchest partisans into Franconia for this purpose. These men stole into Würzburg with their followers, surprised the Bishop on April 15, 1558, as he was on his way from the town to his castle of Frauenberg with a meagre escort, and put him to death. Some of his escort also died of the wounds they received.² Grumbach, although he persisted in declaring that he had only intended to take the Bishop

¹ Feb. 14, 1558. Beck, i. 438. Grumbach had other special ‘affairs’ and ‘alliances.’ After the death of the Margrave Albert Alcibiades in Jan. 1557, the new ruler of the Franeonian land, George Frederic, had refused to pay Albert’s debts (influenced, as is supposed, by the Margrave, Hans von Cüstrin, who wished to marry his daughter to the young Prince of Anspach, and thereby open up to himself the prospect of annexing the territory of the deceased marquis to his family possessions). Grumbach thereupon determined to collect military forces, attack the Bishops of Bamberg and Würzburg and the town of Nuremberg, and compel them to take over the debts of the Margrave Albert. The Elector of Brandenburg and the electoral prince, John George, were not unfriendly to this plan, and thought that the young Prince of Anspach ought to contribute 100,000 thalers towards its execution. The Margrave Hans, however, made objections,^{*} saying that if the scheme did not turn out well George Frederic might be plunged into fresh debts. *Märkische Forschungen*, xiii. 332, 333.

² This murder was an act of private revenge of Christopher Kretzer. Beck, i. 443; Wegele, p. 431.

prisoner, not to assassinate him,¹ nevertheless retained the murderers near him, and appeared openly as their protector and defender.

The Würzburg crime caused tremendous excitement through the whole Empire, and it was lamented that ‘no powerful force was at hand for retribution.’ ‘It was a cruel, barbarous age, and everywhere flourished religious brawls, robbery, and highway murders.’ In a letter from Nuremberg of May 1558 we read: ‘The most frightful cases of murder, robbery, brigandage and highway attacks occur daily, and, indeed, increase daily in number.’²

After the murder of the Bishop, Grumbach took refuge in France, where he remained till the business of recruiting troops for King Henry II. led him back to the court of John Frederic. In March 1559 he represented to the latter that ‘now was the very opportunity for him and his brother, Duke John William, to recover their ancient electoral lands; the French King and the Duke Adolphus of Holstein would help them in the enterprise.’ If the Emperor ‘should be displeased, should raise the cry of the “Landfriede,” and call the imperial circles to arms, he would not be able to raise an army, and the terror-stricken population would not know whither to turn; he also knew ways of giving trouble to the Emperor through the chief feudatories of Bohemia.’³

But ‘affairs in Saxony were not ripe,’ and ‘for the

¹ Gruner, Grumbach, *Abhandl.* pp. 271, 282. On April 5, 1562, Grumbach wrote that he had only contemplated seizing the Bishop by the throat, and that he had not meant to shoot him, although he had full right to do so with his own hand. Köhler, iii. 304.

² Voight, Grumbach, *Abhandl.* i. 185. See above, pp. 95, 96.

³ Orthloff, i. 178–179, 528–533.

timely undertaking of still greater things a divine revelation was needed. Grumbach put himself in communication with a ‘seer of ghosts,’ Hans Tausendschön from Sundhausen, ‘who was frequently visited by angels, the size of three-year-old children, clad in ashen-grey frocks and black hats with white staffs in their hands, and who showed him wonderful things.’ John Frederic installed this ‘divinely-favoured man’ at Weimar, and came gradually ‘to place great confidence in the utterances of the angels ;’ they showed him in a crystal not only his lost electoral hat, but even the imperial crown. In December 1562 Grumbach informed the Duke that ‘the angels had revealed that the Emperor, who was not of the true faith, and who was leading his people away from the Word of God,’ was to be shot by one of Grumbach’s boys ; by command of God, Grumbach said, he had provided this boy with a musket, and the lad was now waiting for a sign from the angels ‘to carry out the divine behest’ and shoot the Emperor. The deed would possibly be committed in the forest of Hagenau, when his Majesty was hunting there. The Duke was told that hereby he might see ‘how wonderful God was, and how He chose out insignificant people to punish the persecutors of His Gospel, so that His divine omnipotence might be recognised.’ Grumbach further believed, he said, that the Catholic Dukes Henry of Brunswick and Albert of Bavaria would, like the Emperor, receive their chastisement at the hands of quite mean persons, ‘because they also were not the least of the persecutors of God’s Word, on whom the priests and their godless crew placed their affections and their trust.’ He also believed that God contemplated ‘a change of

this sort' in the Elector Augustus of Saxony ; in six months' time the Duke, according to the statement of the angels, would find himself once more in possession of the electorate which had been wrested from him. But the first 'change' that was to be accomplished was with the Bishop Frederic of Würzburg ; within three weeks, so the angel announced, this dignitary was to be shot and the bishopric was to pass into the hands of a secular lord. The angels had bidden him set forth on a 'virtuous and knightly expedition' to Würzburg : 'God would grant him His blessing, and good luck in overthrowing the priests.'¹

With the approval of the Duke, Grumbach began recruiting troops, and on September 16, 1563, in conjunction with his former military associates, Wilhelm von Stein and Ernst von Mandelsloe, he issued a writ against Bishop Frederic of Würzburg ; all negotiations for obtaining justice having proved fruitless, they intended taking the matter into their own hands, and bearing down on the enemy. Towards the end of September they invaded the territory of Würzburg with about 300 cavalry and 500 infantry. 'Hundreds of the nobility took part in this most laudable priest-hunt ;' the 'seer of angels' was also of the company, and 'undertook to make himself invisible and to bring a troop of black horsemen into the field.' In the absence of the Bishop, who had sought in vain for help, Würzburg was seized on October 4, and all that savoured of 'priesthood' was treated as spoils of war. The burgomaster and the members of the town council were compelled to swear an oath of allegiance. The cathedral chapter and the episcopal councillors

¹ Ortloff, i. 313-324, 373.

were required to sign a compact agreeing to all Grumbach's stipulations, and also to seal a similar compact in the name of the Bishop. 'To bring the priests to submission they fleeced them to the bone, not omitting also to look about for booty among the wealthy burghers.' 'On this day,' says a contemporary report, 'there were gruesome and unheard-of doings in Würzburg, and so tremendous was the amount of booty taken in the town, that sufficient horses could not be procured to cart away the cases. The town was damaged to the extent of many hundreds of thousands of florins, and not a creature was able to save as much as a spoon.' 'And as it happened to be the time of the annual market, there were Nuremberg and Augsburg merchants among those who were plundered, not to speak of other outrages. Some of the soldiers dressed themselves up in chasubles, hung cow-bells about them, and carried on all sorts of buffoonery.' 'Many of the unmannerly rascals' attempted to assault the women, 'and, when the latter would not yield to them, drove them out of their houses and brought in thither common prostitutes' who completed the pillage. Grumbach informed Duke John Frederic on October 9 that the town had suffered damage to the extent of 200,000 florins, and that it was a judgment of God; everything had happened just as the 'angel-seer' had predicted.¹

According to the agreement extorted from the cathedral chapter and the episcopal councillors, not only

¹ *Kurzer Bericht vom Würzburger Handel* (1563), pp. 4-7. Gropp, i. 248 ff.; Ortloff, i. 402-428. Voigt, *Zweite Abhandlung*, pp. 112-120. Count Louis of Nassau wrote to his brother, Prince William of Orange, on Nov. 1, 1563, that Grumbach and his associates carried away more than 1,100,000 florins' worth of goods from Würzburg. In *Groen van Prinsterer*, suppl. 14*.

was Grumbach to receive his goods back, together with an indemnity, but Ernst von Mandelsloe and Wilhelm von Stein also were to be compensated for all the losses they had suffered in the Margravian war. The Bishop, yielding to necessity, ratified the compact; but the Emperor Ferdinand forbade him to fulfil it because he 'had been coerced by tyrannical threats,' pronounced the ban of the Empire over the organiser of, and the sharers in, this breach of the Public Peace, and addressed repeated orders to Duke John Frederic, to whom Grumbach had returned after leaving Würzburg, not to harbour the outlawed criminals in his territory. The Duke, however, did not deign to answer the Emperor, but 'hoped that things would fall out as the angel-seer had predicted, and as the stars also foretold.' By a fresh prognostication it was announced to him that the House of Austria and the Elector Augustus of Saxony would be brought under his power.¹ At the time of the seizure of Würzburg the Elector Augustus wrote: 'If this conflagration is not extinguished for good and all, much further trouble may result from it.'²

A general 'war of the nobility,' after the fashion of Sickingen, came to be dreaded.³ 'There had been a peasant-war,' it was said, 'and also a war of the princes, and now there must be a war of the nobles.'

¹ Among other things in this prophecy it said:

When death strikes Ferdinandus down,
And to another falls his crown,
Then Augustus loses his electoral right,
The Saxon dukes appear in greater might,
Many bishops lose land and people, &c.

² Droysen, *Aus den dänischen Büchern*, 16.

³ Bucholtz, vii. 473, note; Beck, i. 456; Sattler, iv. 204; Häberlin, v. 602.

On January 27, 1564, at the instigation of Duke Christopher of Würtemberg, an agreement was entered into at Maulbroun by several princes, through their counsellors, to the effect 'that they would lend each other mutual aid and support, in case of their being attacked by the knights.'¹ Duke Albert wrote to Christopher of Würtemberg that he had received tidings that Grumbach and his associates intended to recruit followers among the Bavarian landlords, and with their help first to invade Bavaria, and then the Bishopric of Salzburg (where the peasants of the Pinzgau were even then in revolt), and to carry on their audacious violations of the Public Peace to their hearts' content. The root-principle of all Grumbach's tactics was to gain the adherence of the nobles in all the principalities he entered.²

Grumbach brought up a consignment o' troops, and issued public proclamations to the electors and princes on January 28, and to the whole body of German knights on February 18, announcing that 'a great enterprise' was in prospect. To the princes he explained 'how honourably, peacefully, properly, and harmlessly' he had hitherto behaved, and how, after the failure of all amicable negotiations, 'in consequence of the Public Peace and the imperial rights,' he had been authorised to act as he had done. If the Würzburg compact was not faithfully fulfilled he was resolved, rather than continue any longer in misery and poverty, to set life and property at stake, and in the defence of his righteous cause, to trust to the mercy of God. He summoned the knights to his assistance, telling them that the liberties of the nobility of the whole Empire

¹ Häberlin, v. 642-644.

² v. Aretin, *Maximilian*, p. 136.

and the redress of all existing grievances were the matters at stake. What had happened to him and his associates might befall any nobleman at any moment ; for if the stronger were always to have the right to oppress the weaker, all the nobles would very soon be deprived of their dignity and their liberties, and be brought down to a level with the peasants. He therefore exhorted the whole of the nobility to lend him a hand in defence and offence.¹

Meanwhile ‘the angels’ announced at Weimar that the war would begin at Erfurt. Duke John Frederic was ‘confident in the extreme.’ He wrote to Grumbach on May 5, 1564, that ‘from the Word of God and the writings of Luther he was certain of success ;’ what the ‘angel-seer’ said would, he was sure, come to pass : the mighty deeds of God, which God intended to perform through their agency, would undoubtedly be fulfilled. Grumbach replied that he, too, believed that ‘the angelic proceedings’ were ‘righteous and godly ;’ in Luther’s commentary on good and bad angels there was clear and emphatic confirmation of the righteousness of this course of action.²

The fact that ‘the new Emperor Maximilian was taking up the matter more keenly than his father Ferdinand, and proceeding more fiercely against the outlaws, “served as proof to the conspirators” that he would lose his throne all the sooner.’ It was all in vain that John Frederic’s brothers urged him to submit to the Emperor and to have nothing more to do with the outlawed Grumbach. The Elector only answered by recounting to them (May 2, 1564) how hitherto, in

¹ Häberlin, vi. 2–25.

² Ortloff, ii. 41–42; Gruner, p. 245.

fulfilment of his mission to protect and propagate the pure doctrine of Luther, he had overcome all the assaults of Satan. He told them of the rare and artful devices which Satan had resorted to at the colloquy of Worms, when he, the Duke, had been excluded from the debates, because he had refused to tolerate the Adiaphorists and other sectarians. At that time the cry of ‘Crucifige’ had gone out against him. ‘The devil had further attempted to bring about an amnesty at Frankfort, and to get a “Recess” passed by which the corruptions and falsifications which had crept in should be restored and smoothed over; by the grace of the Almighty, however, we were preserved against this, and the wiles of Satan were confounded.’ Nothing daunted, the devil had then brought together the princes at Naumburg, under the plausible pretext of signing the Augsburg Confession anew, and ‘when our true Christian Confession came under discussion again there was nothing but trouble and distress, and the adversaries would not suffer the truth to be spoken. Again, however, the Lord God had mercy upon us, although all manner of evil reports were spread against us, and we were once more compelled to suffer on the cross with Christ.’ Later on, from fear lest the subjugated House of Saxony should lift up its head again, Satan had kindled a fire of contention among the Saxon theologians, and by means of the Flacians had destroyed all the churches and schools, and created such disturbance everywhere that all public officials were at daggers drawn with each other, and every town and village divided against itself. But even this hellish onslaught had been overcome. Now Satan was again at his old game, endeavouring to suppress the pure doctrine in Saxony.

'And,' said the Elector in conclusion, 'although it is loudly asserted that the Emperor ought to be obeyed in all things, so long as his commands are not in opposition to God, I nevertheless ask your graces whether you are not acting against the Ten Commandments, and whether your consciences can be at rest if you herein follow the commands of the Emperor?' He begged his brothers not 'to break thus wantonly with the Word of God and the pure doctrine.'

'But,' he went on, 'if you are fully minded to pay court to the devil, to subscribe to the Emperor's letter, to follow the advice of wicked people, and perish in soul and body, well then you may go your ways; but you will not, I hope, bear me a grudge because I think right to follow my own conscience and to work for the glory of God, out of a free, pure, and good conscience, in the best way I can.'¹

On September 27, 1564, the 'angels' announced positively that John Frederic would become Emperor. 'It was the purpose of God to set up an Emperor who should better serve the cause of the Gospel and of the poor than did the present one; there would be a complete subversion of the whole country, so that the chosen of the Lord might win everything by the sword.'²

At the earnest persuasion of Grumbach the Duke had removed his court from Weimar to the town of Gotha, which was strongly fortified and protected by the fortress of Grimmenstein. The conspirators, with the Duke's knowledge, had already formed various plans for procuring money for the war; Nuremberg merchants, for instance, were to be attacked and robbed on their way to the Leipzig fair; the Bishop of Metz

Beck, ii. 263-269.

² Ortloff, ii. 204.

was to be seized in order to obtain a large ransom for him.¹ At the bidding of the 'angels' the Duke practised all manner of alchemic arts with 'gold makers.' Two preachers also set up in this line, and, at the Duke's behest, turned their minds to the discovery of the philosopher's stone.²

A manifesto of war had been drawn up as a proclamation from 'the counts, the lords, and the nobility,' who, it was therein stated, were driven to defend themselves against the aggressions of ecclesiastical and secular princes, above all against the Elector Augustus of Saxony, who was draining the country dry, turning the nobles into bond-servants, ousting the Dukes of Saxony, the sons of the former electors, from their possessions, and attempting to bring the whole of Germany under his tyranny. Against such proceedings they were compelled to have recourse to arms. They had chosen Duke John Frederic as their head and ruler, and they were actuated by no other motive in this enterprise than the glory of God and the extension of the pure teaching of the Gospel. Bishops, monks, and priests must be reformed all over the Empire, and the abuse of ecclesiastical property be put a stop to. They hoped that all princes, counts, and knights would join in such a laudable undertaking.³

They actually thought to befool even the Emperor. David Baumgärtner, a patrician of Augsburg, who had been obliged to leave his native town on account of his debts, was sent by Grumbach to Vienna to represent to the Emperor that the German nobles, especially

¹ Ortloff, ii. 162 ff. 169.

² *Ibid.* iii. 271 ff.

³ *Ibid.* ii. 230–240. After the conquest of Gotha the draft of this manifesto fell into the hands of the conquerors (p. 230, note).

Grumbach, Stein, and Mandelsloe, were ready to render him service for the sake of the House of Austria. Augustus of Saxony, the Emperor was to be told, was meditating day and night how he could get possession of the imperial crown. He had already seized the Bishoprics of Meissen, Merseburg, and Naumburg-Zeitz, he had his eyes on the Bishoprics of Magdeburg and Halberstadt, and he wanted also to rob his cousin, Duke John Frederic, of the little that he still possessed. In the event of the Emperor's death, Augustus would certainly keep his heirs from the throne. Maximilian was therefore entreated either to consent to, or at any rate wink at, a plan for falling unexpectedly on the Elector, and depriving him of his lands and people, in order to place them in the hands of the pious, laudable Duke, John Frederic. The Duke's servants, Grumbach, Stein, and Mandelsloe, would procure money and soldiers for the Emperor; through their instrumentality he would become truly master of the Roman Empire, he would be in a position to deal out justice to everybody, and his revenues would be increased.¹ If Maximilian had agreed to these proposals, Grumbach said, all the nobility of the Empire would have been secured.²

In order to get rid of his principal enemy, Grumbach, in 1564 and 1565, made repeated attempts to get the Elector Augustus either assassinated during the chase or else poisoned. Count Günther of Schwarzburg reported to the Elector in 1565 that Grumbach had said to him at Gehren in the Thuringian Forest, that he should not desist from his attempts on the life of the Elector Augustus, by whom his life and those of

¹ Beck, i. 508-509.

² *Ibid.* i. 474 ff.

his associates were threatened, and the attempt would succeed before next Christmas.¹

While the conspirators were waiting for the opportunity to perform more extensive operations, they occupied themselves with perpetrating highway robberies. Not less than forty-six members of the nobility took part in this dignified pursuit, which was carried on chiefly in the lands of the Saxon Elector.²

On May 13, 1566, the ban was judicially pronounced against Grumbach and his associates at the Diet of Augsburg. Maximilian was determined to hear nothing more about lenity and condoning, and this chiefly on account of the Turkish danger.³ A special deputation of electors and princes was sent to John Frederic to exhort him to yield obedience to the laws of the Empire, but the Duke defied all their threats and entreaties.

But it was not enough that the ‘most excellent nobility should conspire the overthrow of the constitution and ‘a general insurrection on behalf of the evangel of Luther;’ the populace also were to be enlisted in the cause. On June 10, 1566, Hans Beyer, a confidential agent of the Duke, drew up a ‘memorial’ for Grumbach, with a view to organising a Bundschuh (armed peasantry): ‘Matters must be settled by war, and the sooner the better;’ and there was no better way of bringing on war than by an insurrection of the people. ‘The godless popish priests must be massacred wholesale, and then, after the election of a “Christian head,” the Augsburg Confession be established everywhere. The goods of the priests would furnish ample means for

¹ v. Weber, *Anna*, pp. 10-12.

² Ortloff, ii. 322 ff., 366-385, and 3, 7, 40-41.

³ See Wegele (from the *Würzburger Reichstagsacten*), p. 436.

carrying on the war. Not for nothing had Luther prophesied in many places that the Pope must go to the ground. This consummation must be brought about by massacring every single cardinal, bishop, abbot, monk, and priest, and not sparing the life of one of them.' If once they got Erfurt into their hands all the rest would be easily managed. A banner of the league was to be set up with a device announcing the object of the undertaking to the people.¹

'In all directions they looked round for aid and support.' The Dithmarsers, actuated by the hope of recovering the territorial privileges wrested from them by the Dukes of Holstein, declared themselves ready to join the league and to send money contributions. The King of Sweden also proffered his services, through his Chancellor Güldenstern, and to him John Frederic proposed that, after the example of the French King, 'he should always maintain in Germany a certain number of duly appointed captains and cavalry officers, through whose agency soldiers could easily be got together at any time.'²

¹ Ortloff, iii. 153-157. On both sides of the banner, which was designed by Hans Beyer, was a representation of a Bundschuh. On one side, on the band over the shoe was the motto, 'Facere justitiam,' and so forth, and under the shoe, was inscribed: 'For the maintenance of the pure Word of God, and the spread of the Augsburg Confession. To preserve the ancient, laudable freedom of the Germans. To promote God-fearing, Christian conduct, discipline, and morality. 1566.' On the reverse side of the banner, above the shoe, was the inscription, 'Wo, wo to thee, Pope, wo to you cardinals, bishops, abbots, and all you monks and priests.' And under the shoe: '1 Reg. cap. 17: And when all the people saw it, they fell on their faces; and they said, The Lord, He is the God; the Lord, He is the God. And Elijah said unto them, Take the prophets of Baal; let not one of them escape. And they took them. Dr. Martin Luther, the other Elias, Vivus eram pestis, moriens ero mors tua, papa' ('Living, I was thy plague; dead, I shall be thy death, O Pope!'). In Ortloff, iii. 164, note 1.

² Ortloff, iii. 263; Beck, i. 570. 'The worst danger that we have

Alliances were also contracted with the nobles of the Netherlands who were in rebellion against King Philip II., and 'the French nobles, weary of the King's yoke,' also 'signified their willingness to help.' The conspirators were all the more hopeful of the result because in the summer of 1566 the Emperor had become involved in one of the most serious of Turkish campaigns. 'The angels' actually held out to Duke John Frederic the prospect of obtaining two empires and a kingdom in this very year. According to the plan of Grumbach regiments were to be raised in Westphalia and on the Rhine, the Rhenish bishoprics to be plundered as the first step, and then an invasion to be effected in Franconia, with plunder and robbery of the Bishop of Würzburg, after which the Elector of Saxony was to be driven into a corner, and contributions levied on the towns of Mühlhausen, Nordhausen, and Erfurt. Several regiments were to be placed simultaneously in the Mark and in Pomerania in order to surprise the Elector Joachim II. and drive him out of his territory ; and finally, after the junction of both armies, Duke John Frederic was to be proclaimed Elector at Wittenberg, and even Emperor of Germany.¹ Banners with the imperial crown were already prepared.²

been exposed to,' wrote the Elector Augustus to King Frederic of Denmark, on Feb. 21, 1567, 'came from the Swedish intrigues. . . . It is especially evident from the captured letters that Sweden, in joining the league, had designs not only against your Royal Majesty, but also against the Emperor.' The Margrave, Hans von Cüstrin, and Duke John Albert of Mecklenburg had also a hand in the game. Droysen, from the *Danish Books*, pp. 74-75. See pp. 63-72.

¹ Beck, i. 493-494; Ortloff, ii. 296. Droysen, *Aus den dänischen Büchern*, pp. 37 ff. Sixteen years before, in 1550, Duke John Frederic had already drawn up a great plan of warfare for the extirpation of the 'popish priests.' See fuller remarks by us in Vol. vi. 424.

² These were afterwards found at Gotha. See v. Bezold, *Briefe Johann Casimir's*, ii. 150, No. 196.

But ‘the angels’ had been mistaken in their dates. On December 12, 1566, the Emperor pronounced the ban on John Frederic and ordered the Elector Augustus to enforce the sentence at once ; he also enjoined Duke John William, brother of the victim, to help in the execution of the penalty. John Frederic received the imperial herald, who brought him the mandate of outlawry and the imperial order of renunciation, and also the herald of the Elector Augustus, with the greatest composure. He caused the artillery on the castle ramparts to be shown to their august messengers so as to let them know how he was protected, and he said : ‘Augustus was welcome to come ; he had been baking and brewing for him for a long time past.’ By the advice of the ‘angel-seer’ he assumed the title of ‘Elector of Saxony by birth,’ called his chancellery ‘the electoral chancellery of Saxony,’ and had the electoral swords introduced into his armorial bearings and engraved on the coins which he caused to be struck. He ordered gold swords to be made for rewards to his captains. Little did he reckon on a speedy execution of the ban. Nevertheless, on December 24, Gotha was invested by an army from the Saxon electorate, and a few weeks later the Elector Augustus and Duke John William appeared in full battle array before the town.

John Frederic delivered a harangue to his troops and to the citizens of Gotha, telling them that the sole object of the Elector Augustus was to suppress the true religion of the Gospel, and that he was egged on by the priests ; he exhorted them to have courage, and tried to reassure them with the hope of foreign help. When John William summoned the Saxon provincial

Estates of Saxony to meet at Saalfeld in order to consult over the perilous position of the land, John Frederic demanded of them instant help ; his brother, he said, ‘had been bought by the papists and had turned traitor to the true cause ; the whole business was nothing more or less than an infamous plot of the abominable priests of Baal.’ The besieged city waited in daily expectation of strong succour from Ernst von Mandelsloe, who was to have come up with large forces of soldiers. Grumbach sent him urgent appeals to hasten to their relief, and to attack the enemy in their fat farms, where the booty would be dealt out not with spoons but with bushel measures, and velvet and gold-embroidered cloth be measured out to them by spear-lengths. ‘As for the Emperor’s command and prohibition, his own act of perjury, committed in order to obtain the imperial throne and majesty, would in due time richly find him out, and bring condign punishment on him.’¹

When all hope of relief was at an end the Duke and Grumbach, on April 3, 1567, formed the desperate resolve to remove all the provisions and goods and chattels that were in the town, as well as the best of the troops, to the castle, to send away the rest of the inhabitants, and then set fire to the town at the four corners. But a mutiny which broke out among the soldiers hindered the execution of this plan. The mutineers imprisoned Colonel von Brandenstein, commandant of the fortress, assaulted the castle, and, regardless of all the Duke’s prayers and supplications, possessed themselves of the persons of the Chancellor

¹ Voigt, Grumbach, *Zweite Abhandlung*, pp. 200-210. Ortloff, iii. 457-478, 537; Beck, i. 531, 536-538, 544.

Brück, of Wilhelm von Stein, and of other adherents of Grumbach. Grumbach himself they dragged out of his bed and carried on a hearse to join the other prisoners in the council-house, where his hands and feet were laid in chains by a smith. As they bore him along they cried out: ‘We have got the bride!’ A committee was formed from among the nobles, the captains, and the burghers, and on April 13 the town was handed over by this body to the Elector Augustus. The garrison withdrew, the burghers asked for pardon on their knees, and swore allegiance to Duke John William as their new lord.¹ John Frederic was delivered up to the conqueror, to be dealt with at the Emperor’s pleasure, and taken to Dresden. Even after his capture and removal he ‘continued in the hope that all would still go well with him.’ In the Abrechtsburg near Meissen, where he was lodged during the night, he wrote on the wall with a pencil: ‘*Es gelückt noch wohl*’ (‘There is still a chance’). His companion, the preacher Roth, reported a rumour to the effect that the Duke was informed by a special revelation and prophecy that ‘it was necessary that he should first of all be thus deprived of his land and subjects, and that afterwards he would attain to that height of eminence which he had so long striven after.’² From Dresden John Frederic was taken to Vienna and lodged in the castle at Wienerisch-Neustadt, whence, in course of time, he was removed to Steyer, in Upper Austria, there to endure perpetual imprisonment.

At Gotha, meanwhile, on April 14, the trial and

¹ In the town and on the Grinmenstein, enormous stores of provisions were found. See Glasey, pp. 233–234.

² Ortloff, iv. 275–276.

examination of the prisoners began ‘with gruesome torture.’ The Elector Augustus and Duke John William, from behind a silken curtain, ‘indulged in the inhuman gratification of looking on at the terrible tortures inflicted.’ ‘It was plainly manifest from the whole procedure how inhuman the times had become, and how little the gospel of love worked in the hearts of those princes, albeit it was always on their lips.’ The Chancellor Brück implored Count Günther of Schwarzburg to intercede for him with the princes, and, if his life was not granted, to beg that at any rate he might be condemned to death by the sword and spared the torture of the rack. But the Count, who considered himself to have been defrauded by the chancellor some years before in the purchase of a lordship of Brück, took the opportunity of revenging himself: ‘You rascal,’ he said, ‘you tried once to cheat me out of my due; you shall now be requited with the full mercy you deserve.’ Not one whit more merciful was the Elector of Saxony’s councillor, Doctor Craco, to whom Brück had also appealed, reminding him of all that his father, the old Chancellor Brück, had done for the house of Saxony and for the evangelical cause, and trying further to work on Craco’s feelings by recalling the fact that he (Craco) had formerly been his father’s pupil at Wittenberg. Craco, however, was unmoved. He called him insulting names and told him that ‘if he had received instruction from his father he had paid him for it; and if his father had been such an exemplary man, he ought to have taken pattern by him.’¹ At the time when he was in power Brück had ordered a secretary of the Duke to be put in chains on a mere trifling

¹ Gruner, p. 286; Beck i. 572.

charge, and to be laid twice on the rack. He had himself looked on while the torment was being inflicted, urging on the executioner to greater and greater cruelty, till at last the man had declared that if he stretched the victim any tighter his body would snap in two like a fiddle string, the blood already gushing out at the navel.¹ This same secretary was now a witness of Brück's tortures. Brück and Grumbach were tried and interrogated during four successive days, and put on the rack each day. ‘Their screams were so terrific,’ says a report, ‘that they could be heard all over the castle.’ Doctor Craco must have remembered these days when he himself, later on, was condemned by the Elector Augustus to similar suffering.

The sentence passed on Grumbach was, that from the enormity of his crimes he deserved the most extreme penalty, but that the Elector, in the greatness of his mercy, would modify the sentence to ‘quartering alive.’ Brück was condemned to the same punishment without mention of the Elector’s ‘mercy.’ Wilhelm von Stein was to be beheaded first and afterwards quartered; Hans Beyer and the ‘angel-seer’ were both to be hanged.

The brutal exhibition took place on April 18, on the market place of Gotha in the presence of the Elector and ‘a barbarous and grand assemblage of princes, counts, nobles, and soldiers, besides a multitude of burghers and peasants.’ At ten o’clock in the morning Grumbach, an infirm, palsied man of sixty-four, was carried to the scaffold on an old chair by eight gaol officials. When he reached the place of execution eight trumpets were sounded. ‘The executioners,’

¹ Köhler, xii. 405–406; Beck, i. 489.

says an eye-witness, ‘first cut his heart out of his body, then struck him on the mouth with it, and finally chopped him in four quarters.’ Brück’s entreaty that they would cut off his head before quartering him was in vain: if they were to do that, the executioners said, they would not be carrying out the orders of his Electoral Grace. When his body was being ripped open he prayed with a loud voice: ‘Merciful God, have pity on me.’ The other condemned criminals then underwent their respective punishments. Of Hans Beyer, who was hanged, it says: ‘He met death with resignation, and had a beautiful end.’ A peasant bought the bloody scaffold and built himself a dwelling-room out of its boards.

The Elector Augustus boasted in Gotha of the things that had been done, and commemorated them on a memorial coin in the following inscription:—‘At last the good cause has triumphed.’ At last, says the poet of the ‘Nightingale,’

At last Augustus home repaired,
When all his business well he’d squared ;
The devils then were wild with glee,
They danced and sang loud jubilee ;
Such deeds our children’s children will
Revenge, when these in death are still.
We’ve kindled in the German nation
A mighty, blazing conflagration ;
For many a day ’twill burn and rage,
If no one can its fire assuage.¹

¹ See Voigt, *Zweite Abhandlung*, pp. 246 ff.; Beck, i. 569–584; Menzel, ii. 434–435. For the names of many of the songs and poems relating to the Grumbach affair see the catalogue in Ortloff, iv. 546–560. For the *Nachtigall* especially, see pp. 324–334; Koch, ii. 7 f. 165–166; and Calinich’s *Aus dem 16. Jahrhundert*, pp. 262–278. The author of the poem, which was first brought back to light by Lessing, was Wilhelm Klebitz, the Heidelberg deacon, who is mentioned at pp. 69, 70 of this vol. For Maximilian’s threatening attitude towards the Elector Palatine Frederic III. on account of the *Nachtigall*, see Kluckhohn, *Friedrich*

The fire burnt steadily on.

The full extent of danger to the Empire that might have arisen from this rebellious enterprise of the Duchy of Saxony and of Grumbach only became known to the Emperor through the documents sent to Vienna from the ducal chancellery. When, in May 1567, the most influential of the Estates, headed by the three spiritual electors, interceded with the Emperor on behalf of the captive John Frederic, and begged for his speedy release, Maximilian answered that he had assured himself, by looking through secret papers, that even worse guilt had been perpetrated than had previously come to light. The Duke was not 'on the level of an ordinary participator in the insurrection and conspiracy, but he had been convicted of being chief leader, and self-elected commander-in-chief, of an enterprise which aimed at nothing less than overturning the whole Empire, and kindling such a gigantic conflagration that the Fatherland and the peace-loving Estates belonging to it would have been plunged into unutterable anguish, suffering, tribulation, and danger, and even the Emperor's majesty and throne would not have been spared.'¹ On

der Fromme, pp. 291–293. Concerning Caspar Weidling, of whom Koch (ii. 21) makes very slight mention, for want of fuller information, there is a parcel of papers in the Frankfort archives (*Reichssachen*, 1566–1568). He was a bankrupt merchant and had been put in prison at Frankfort for committing a highway robbery and for taking part in the Grumbach proceedings. In a despatch from Vienna, Aug. 11, 1567, the Emperor ordered the council at Frankfort to put in prison the author of the *Nachtigall*, Wilhelm Cleovitus, whose wife and children lived at Frankfort.

¹ Gruner, *Urkunden*, No. 21. In the year 1571 the three spiritual electors addressed a written petition to the Elector Augustus beseeching him in most supplicating terms to have pity on John Frederic, although, according to Grumbach's statement, their lands were destined as the first booty of the conspirators; 'very significant this of the then attitude

August 11, 1567, the Emperor informed the delegates at a Diet at Erfurt that it had come to his knowledge that the escaped Ernst von Mandelsloe, the chief of the proscribed criminals, and his followers were exerting themselves incessantly to raise fresh tumult, sedition, and rebellion in the holy Empire, and were above all plotting to stir up a general rising of subjects against their legitimate rulers, and of feudal vassals against their liege lords. He had also, he said, received trustworthy information to the effect that various people of distinction in the Empire, who had 'previously had a hand in the insurrectionary scheme, were still implicated in treacherous intrigues.'¹

After the signal disgrace of Duke John Frederic such 'persons of distinction' were no longer found among the Lutheran party. The centre of all the revolutionary endeavours to overthrow the constitution of the Empire and exterminate the Catholic Church now became removed to the Calvinistic court of Heidelberg, which was in league with foreign nations.

of the Catholics,' remarks Menzel, ii. 436. 'Popish love of persecution' does not appear in this transaction.

¹ Koch, *Quellen*, ii. 51.

INDEX OF PLACES

ADELBERG (abbey), 79
Aix-la-Chapelle (Aachen), 193 (*n.* 1)
Aken (Acken, village), 292
Albrechtsburg, near Meissen, 396
Alsatia (Alsace), 94
Altehhausen (Aldenhäusen), 293
Altötting, 173
Amberg (town), 61, 315
Anhalt (principality), 34, 51, 135
Astrachan, 112
Augsburg (bishopric), 30, 108, 127,
 184, 196 f., 203, 207 f., 236, 254,
 262, 271
Augsburg (town), 119, 127, 173,
 383, 389
Augsburg (Confession), 2 f., 31 f.,
 34–38, 41, 47, 60, 68 f., 76, 86, 97,
 100, 109, 116, 113–121, 125, 129,
 134, 137, 139, 141, 145 f., 150,
 183, 189 f., 201, 204, 207, 210,
 213–224, 227, 230, 233, 235, 245,
 305, 313 f., 322, 324, 327, 332,
 339 f., 347–352, 355–366, 369–
 376, 387, 391
Augsburg (Apology), 32, 36, 47, 68,
 218, 278, 354
Augsburg (Ecclesiastical Reservation),
 97–104, 106, 124, 129, 132,
 332, 343, 346, 356
Augsburg (Interim, 1548), 82, 283,
 294
Augsburg (Diets, 1555), 1, 37, 85,
 100; (1559) 106, 114, 116, 120–
 132, 134, 137, 185, 187, 190, 205,
 209, 349, 357; (1566) 344, 345–
 376, 377, 391
Augsburg (Religious Peace), 1, 10,
 29, 78, 83, 85, 93, 95, 97, 100, 103,
 104, 119, 122, 125, 129 ff., 135,
 189, 201, 219, 225, 235, 327, 329,
 340, 343, 346 ff., 360, 369 f.,
 376

Austria, Imperial Hereditary Lands,
 116, 150, 151–167, 173 (*n.* 5), 176,
 180, 245, 258, 329

BADEN (margraviate), 47, 118, 318
 322 ff., 361 f.
Baltic (sea), 112
Bamberg (bishopric), 119, 182, 379
 (*n.* 1)
Basle (town), 67
Basle (council), 200, 242
Bavaria (duchy), 41, 100, 118 f.,
 167, 168–180, 198, 203, 207, 210,
 236, 240, 243, 248, 257, 349, 369,
 375, 381, 385
Belgium, 67
Berlin (town), 57, 230, 291, 296, 299
Berlin (state archives), 333 (*n.* 1),
 338 (*n.* 2)
Blaubeuren (abbey), 79
Bohemia, 49, 61, 96 (*n.* 3), 104, 203,
 206, 269, 329, 380
Bohemia (Bohemian Brothers), 38
Bourges, 67
Bourgogne. *See* Burgundy
Bourgueil (abbey), 266 (*n.* 1)
Brabant, 323
Brandenburg (bishopric), 134
Brandenburg (Mark, electorate), 37,
 47, 115, 119, 127, 135, 206, 213,
 216, 222, 230, 293–299, 333, 338,
 340, 347, 365, 372
Brandenburg-Cüstrin (margraviate),
 13, 34, 216, 332 f., 379 (*n.* 1),
 392 (*n.* 2)
Brandenburg, Franconian part
(margraviates of Anspach, Bayreuth,
 and Culmbach), 39 (*n.* 4),
 68, 378, 384
Bremen (archbishopric), 134
Bremen (town), 55, 58, 278–283

Bremen (cathedral), 280
 Brennberg (in the district of Straubing), 176
 Breslau (town), 138
 Brixen (bishopric), 153
 Brumby, 291
 Brunswick-Lüneburg, 135
 Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel (duchy), 36, 38, 41 f., 135, 305, 381
 Brunswick (town), 20 f., 55, 291
 Brussels (town), 50 (n. 1)
 Buckau (Bückaw), 291
 Burgundy, 136

CABARDEY, 112
 Calbe, 291
 Commim, 134
 Caspian Sea, 112
 Caucasus, 112
 Chaise-Dieu (abbey), 266 (n. 1)
 Château-Cambrésis (Peace of 1559), 107, 120
 Châtillon (abbey), 266 (n. 1)
 Cleves (duchy). *See* Jülich-Cleves
 Cörelitz, 293
 Cologne (archbishopric), 238, 244, 251, 336, 400
 Cologne (town), 185, 203, 255 (n. 1)
 Colmar, 172
 Constancee (town), 203
 Constance (council), 200, 265
 Curland, 116

DANTZIC, 282
 Denmark, 39, 44, 47, 113, 216, 240, 280, 306, 392 (n. 2)
 Dillingen, 9 (n. 1)
 Dirmstein, 320
 Dithmarsen, 392
 Dorpat, 113
 Dresden (State archives), 365
 Drösing, 164
 Dscherbe, 198
 Düsseldorf (State archives), 249

EBENDORF, 292
 Ebingen in Würtemberg, 88 (n. 1)
 Egenburg (monastery), 158
 Eichsfeld, the (district), 183, 184 (n. 1)
 Eichstädt (bishopric), 169
 Eisenach, 127

Eisleben, 297 (n. 1)
 Elbe, the, 140
 Emden (county), 281
 England, 58, 107, 112, 216, 224, 240, 323, 336
 Enns (river) (*das Erzherzogthum unter und ob der Enns*: the archduchy of Upper and Lower Austria), 156
 Enns (town), 200
 Erfurt (town), 184, 229, 386, 392
 Erfurt (Diet), 401
 Ermland (bishopric), 202, 242, 334
 Estonia, 115
 Europe, 94, 173 (n. 5), 185 (n. 1)
 Exaeten (library), 40

FALKENTHAL, 165
 Florian, St. (monastery), 157
 France, 67, 94 f., 106-111, 120, 136, 199, 201, 369 f., 380, 392 f.
 Franconia, 182, 379, 393
 Frankfort-on-the-Main (town), 47 f., 67, 96 (nn. 1, 2), 99, 104, 110, 121, 126, 130 f., 357, 367, 377
 Frankfort-on-the-Main (archives), 399 (n. 1).
 Frankfort-on-the-Main (Protestant Diet, 1557), 31
 Frankfort-on-the-Main (Recess, 1558), 46-52, 55, 58, 74, 144, 213, 219, 293 f., 340, 363, 387
 Frankfort-on-the-Main (Election Diet, 1558), 47 f., 104, 120, 339
 Frankfort-on-the-Oder (town), 294; (suburb of Lebus), 299
 Frankfort-on-the-Oder (university), 297 (n. 1)
 Frauenberg. *See* Würzburg
 Frauenzell (monastery), 176
 Frohse, 293
 Furstenzell (monastery), 172
 Fulda (bishopric), 182
 Fulda (town), 58, 183

GARSTEN (monastery), 157
 Gehren (in the Thuringian forest), 390
 George, St. (abbey), 79
 Geras (monastery), 157
 Geresdorf, 164
 Gleink (monastery), 157
 Gnadenberg (monastery), 61

Gnadenzell, at Offenhausen (nun-
nery), 86
Gobelsburg, 164
Göppingen, 341
Goslar, 22
Gotha (town), 19, 389 (*n.* 3), 393
 (*n.* 2), 394-399
Graz, 158
Greece (Church of), 250
Grimmenstein (fortress), 146
Gutenswegen (Gudensweg), 291

HAGENAU (forest), 381
Halberstadt (bishopric), 134
Halle, 287, 291
Hamburg, 26, 51, 55, 58, 114, 282 f.
Hartz (mountains), 148
Havelberg (bishopric), 134
Heidelberg (town and court), 60,
 67, 279, 315, 338, 348, 399 (*n.* 1)
Heidelberg (university), 67, 77, 273,
 315, 324
Heidelberg (Catechism), 316, 324 f.,
 342, 348, 362
Heidelberg (Disputation of 1560),
 71
Henneberg (county), 51
Herrenberg, in Würtemberg, 88
 (*n.* 1)
Herzogenburg (monastery), 157
Hesse, 4, 15 (*n.* 1), 31, 47, 57, 100,
 108, 119, 135 ff., 139, 144, 183,
 190, 214 ff., 221, 237, 322 (*n.* 1),
 324, 333, 346, 367
Hildesheim (town), 28
Hilsbach (congress of princes), 214,
 224
Himmelskrone (nunney), 317
Hirschau (Hirsau, abbey), 79
Hochberg (county), 318 (*n.* 2)
Hohendorfleben (Hohendorf-
lene), 293
Holstein (duchy), 380, 392
Holy Cross near Meissen (nunney),
 318 (*n.* 2)
Huguenots, 317, 369 (*n.* 1)
Hungary, 96 (*n.* 3), 98, 117, 252,
 269

ILLYRIA, 11
Ingelheim Grund, 322 (*n.* 1)
Ingolstadt (town), 92 (*n.* 1)
Italy, 111

JENA (town), 143, 275, 281, 285
 (*n.* 1)
Jena (university, or theologian),
 20, 33, 143
Jena (Book of Confutation, 1559),
 52 ff., 145 ff.
Jerichow, 293
Jerusalem, 229
Judah, Jews, 72, 117, 201
Jülich-Cleves (duchy), 248 (*n.* 1)

KAMP (river), 165
Kasan, 112
Kilchberg (Königsberg), 318 (*n.* 2)
Kirchheim in Würtemberg, 88 (*n.* 1)
Klosternenburg, 157
Königsberg (town), 12-17, 302, 309
Königsberg (university), 12-17, 302,
 306
Kreuzburg (district), 303
Kuhlhäusen (Kulhusen), 291
Kurbrandenburg, Kurpfalz, Kur-
 sachsen, &c. *See* Brandenburg,
 Palatinate, Saxony, &c.

LADENBURG, 321
Lanciano (archbishopric), 240
Landsberg (League), 119
Landshut (Provincial Assembly,
 1553), 178
Laufen in Würtemberg, 88 (*n.* 1)
Lebus (bishopric), 134
Lebus (suburb of). *See* Frankfort-
 on-the-Oder
Leipsic (university), 75
Leipsic (Interim, 1548), 48
Lesina (bishopric), 209
Leuchtenburg, the, 146
Lichtenstern in Würtemberg, 88
 (*n.* 1)
Liebenau (nunney), 317
Lithuania, 112
Livonia, 112-116, 225
Lorraine, 106, 110
Lower Austria, 156, 165 f., 266
Lower Germany, 212
Lower Netherlands, 95
Lower Saxony, 52, 274, 280, 291
Lübeck (bishopric), 134
Lübeck (town), 51, 114, 138, 282,
 310
Lüneburg (principality). *See* Bruns-
 wick

Lüneburg (town), 51, 138
 Lüneburg (Convention, 1561), 273,
 285 f., 291
 Lützeststein (district). 64
 Lyons, 317

MAGDEBURG (archbishopric), 134,
 232, 286, 291, 390
 Magdeburg (town), 51, 283, 291
 Magdeburg (Church Ordinances),
 283

Mansfeld (county), 18
 Marbach, 88
 Marburg (town), 215
 Maria Reuthin, near Wildberg
 (Dominican nunnery), 80
 Markgröningen, in Würtemberg,
 88 (n. 1)

Mattigkofen (castle), 173 (n. 5)
 Maulbronn (monastery, Religious
 Conference, 1564), 325
 Maulbronn (Treaty, 1564), 385
 Mayence (archbishopric), 183, 238,
 244, 252, 269, 282, 336, 400
 Mayence (town), 341
 Mecklenburg (duchy), 7, 23, 50 (n. 1),
 113, 216, 220, 313 (n. 2), 349,
 365, 375, 392 (n. 2)
 Meissen (bishopric), 132 f., 390
 Meissen (marquavate). *See* Saxe-
 Meissen
 Meissen (town), 19
 Merseburg (bishopric), 133, 251, 390
 Metten (monastery), 172
 Metz (bishopric), 107, 388
 Metz (town), 107
 Minden (bishopric), 134
 Mödring, 107
 Mölk (abbey), 157
 Mongolia, 112
 Montefiascone (bishopric), 264
 Moscow, 112, 114
 Münchenreidt, 162
 Münster (bishopric), 252 (n. 1)
 Münster (town), 281
 Munich (town), 175, 199, 368
 Munich (imperial archives), 237
 (n. 1)
 Murrkard (monastery), 79

NAPLES (kingdom), 261
 Narva, 113
 Naumburg (= Zeitz, bishopric), 19,
 38, 134, 251, 290, 390

Naumburg (congress of princes),
 212, 213-229, 272, 285, 293, 313,
 334, 340, 353, 363, 387
 Netherland. *See* the Baltic Sea
 Netherlands, the, 369, 393
 Neuffen (fortress), 79
 Neuhausen (abbey), 321, 362, 376
 Nordhansen, 393
 North Germany, 115, 163, 273-312
 Novgorod (archbishopric), 113
 Nuremberg, 51, 119, 127

OPPENHEIM (Marienkrone), 318
 (n. 2)
 Oppenheim (town), 322 (n. 1)
 Osnabrück (bishopric), 134

PALATINATE, the (Pfalz), 29, 31, 33,
 37, 47, 59, 60-72, 79, 94, 98 f.,
 108, 115, 117 f., 122, 124, 126 f.,
 131, 144, 150, 191, 206, 213, 219-
 222, 224, 245, 312, 313-326, 333,
 339, 341 ff., 346-356, 361-376,
 377, 399
 Paris, 95, 109
 Passau (bishopric), 260
 Passau (Treaty, 1552), 79, 85, 100
 Pfalz-Simmern, 68
 Pfalz-Zweibrücken, 33, 47, 72 (n. 4),
 110, 192, 214, 323, 341, 343,
 347 ff., 352, 365, 367, 372
 Pforzheim, 318 (n. 2)
 Pfullingen, 82, 84
 Pinzgau, 385
 Poland, 50, 94, 111, 116, 233
 Pomerania, 51, 135, 216, 349
 Pomesania (bishopric), 196
 Prague (archbishopric), 235 (n. 1)
 Prague (town), 244 (n. 2)
 Prussia, 12-17, 39 (n. 4), 45, 112,
 116, 138, 143, 215, 302-312

RATISBON (Diet, 1556-1557), 29, 38,
 42, 95-69, 117, 123, 130, 349
 Ratisbon (town), 31, 50 (n. 1), 56,
 127, 203
 Rhenish Palatinate, 63, 66, 317
 Rhine, Rhineland, 94, 135, 187,
 393
 Riga (archbishopric), 112 f.
 Rittenau, 85

Rome (Ancient), 261
 Rome (Christian), 4, 6, 7, 19, 104,
 155 (*n.* 2), 199, 204, 208, 228, 230,
 236, 239, 246, 253, 269, 334
 Rostock (town), 22–27, 67
 Rostock (university), 22, 25
 Russia, 106, 111 f., 211, 225

SAALFELD (Provincial Diet), 395
 Salzburg (archbishopric), 119, 181,
 182, 239, 244 (*n.* 2), 252, 331, 385
 Salzburg (town), 181
 Salzburg (Provincial Synod, 1549),
 171
 Samland (bishopric), 305, 310
 Sandau (district), 293
 Saxe-Gotha, 13, 15 (*n.* 1), 31 (*n.* 1),
 39, 41, 52, 58, 68, 71, 108, 117,
 121, 135, 144–150, 206, 215 f.,
 218 ff., 224, 273 f., 310, 314, 316 f.,
 347, 380, 382, 384, 387–401
 Saxe-Meissen, 255, 280 f.
 Saxe-Weimar, 215, 245, 346, 380,
 387, 393
 Saxon lands (Ernestine Lim), 377
 Saxony (electorate), 31 (*n.* 1), 47,
 55, 58, 77, 94, 99, 119 f., 126 f.,
 132, 135, 140 (*n.* 2), 202, 206, 213,
 218 f., 224, 276, 318 (*n.* 2), 320,
 323, 333, 338, 340, 343, 346 f.,
 348, 351, 358, 364–369, 371, 376,
 380, 382, 384, 387, 389, 393–400
 Scandinavia, 111
 Schärding, 179
 Schönebeck, 292
 Schrattenberg, 164
 Schwarz, 292
 Schweinfurt, 28 (*n.* 3)
 Schwerin (bishopric), 134
 Scotland, 216, 240
 Seligenporten (nunnery), 62
 Semgall, 116
 Sicily, 261
 Silesia, 245 (*n.* 2)
 Simmern. *See* Pfalz-Simmern
 Simter, 320
 Sinsheim, 320, 362, 376
 Smalcald (articles), 32, 69, 220 f.,
 305
 Smalcald (war), 135
 South Germany (Upper), 31, 95,
 115, 212, 230
 Spires (bishopric), 320 (*n.* 1)

Sponheim (county), 322
 Stargard, 27
 Steinabrmnn, 164
 Steinfurt, 321
 Steinheim-on the-Murr, 85
 Stendal, 292
 Stettin (Provincial Diet, 1558), 28
 Strasburg (town), 2, 71, 94, 127
 Straubing, 175 f.
 Stützenhofen, 164
 Stuttgart (town), 77, 313
 Suabia, 135
 Sundhausen, 381
 Sweden, 112, 216, 240
 Switzerland, 77, 94, 137, 188, 240

TINA (bishopric), 252, 253
 Toul (town), 107
 Transylvania, 99
 Trent (Council), 34, 122, 167, 178,
 195, 196–205, 208 f., 214–216,
 225–232, 234–253, 258, 261–272,
 334, 341, 360
 Trent (town), 225
 Treves (archbishopric), 37, 42 (*n.* 2),
 185, 187, 189, 238, 252, 336, 400
 Treves (town), 187–192, 193 (*n.* 1)
 Trullus (Synod, 692), 250
 Tübingen (university, or theo-
 logians), 40, 273, 311
 Turkey, 29, 96, 98, 115, 117, 136,
 153 f., 198, 202, 211, 224, 271,
 278, 326, 329, 362, 375, 391
 Tyrol, the, 153, 182

UPPER Austria, 156
 Upper Palatinate, 63 f.
 Upper Rhine, 94

VENICE, 11, 95, 118, 200, 234, 265,
 271
 Vercelli, 241
 Verden (bishopric), 134
 Verdun (bishopric), 107
 Verdun (town), 107
 Vienna (town and court), 151, 155,
 204, 229, 244 (*n.* 2), 334, 389, 396,
 399 (*n.* 1)
 Vienna (university), 154
 Vienna (Conference, 1563), 251
 Viennese Neustadt (town) (Wien-
 erisch-), 396

WALDSASSEN (monastery), 61
Weiler, near Blaubeuren (nunnery), 88
Weiler, near Esslingen (Dominican nunnery), 85
Weimar (religious conference, 1560), 147 ff.
Weimar (town), 43, 146, 148, 377, 381, 386
Wesel-on-the-Lower Rhine, 21
Wesenberg, 112
Western Europe, 111
Westphalia, or Westphalian Circle, 282, 393
Wismar, 51
Wittenberg (town), 14, 17, 21, 45, 139, 142, 247, 291, 393, 397
Wittenberg (university or theologians), 17, 21, 33, 55, 75, 77, 139, 143, 184, 276, 281, 292, 295, 326
Wittenberg (Concord), 40
Wolmirstedt, 284, 291

Woltersdorf (Wolterstorf), 293
Worms (bishopric), 317, 320 f., 361
Worms (town), 42, 184 (*n.* 2)
Worms (religious conference, 1557), 28, 29–43 (*n.* 1), 46, 49, 55, 122 f., 134, 220, 387
Württemberg, 5, 31, 38, 43, 46 f., 59, 73, 74–89, 98 f., 104, 108 f., 117 ff., 136, 144, 150, 192, 206, 213 f., 223, 274, 313, 317, 318 (*n.* 2), 323, 332, 336, 340 f., 343, 348, 352, 357, 365, 372, 385
Würzburg (bishopric), 119, 378–384, 393
Würzburg (castle of Frauenberg), 379
Würzburg (town), 379–385

ZANTE (bishopric), 212
Zeitz. *See* Naumburg
Zeppernick, 291
Zweibrücken (county) *See* Pfalz
Zweibrücken (town), 190

INDEX OF PERSONS

ADELER (preacher), 25
Adolphus IX. (Duke of Holstein-Gottorp), 380, 392
Adrian VI. (Pope), 267
Æpinus, John (superintendent), 13, 26
Agricola, John (court preacher), 57, 294, 296
Alber, Matthäus, 40
Albrecht von Brandenburg (Archbishop of Mayence), 184 (*n.* 4), 282
Albrecht V. (Duke of Bavaria), 109, 118 ff., 167, 173–177, 198 f., 203 f., 208, 210 f., 236 f., 240 f., 243 f., 248 f., 252, 349, 368, 375, 381, 385
Albrecht I. (Duke of Prussia), 13 f., 39 (*n.* 4), 45, 116, 138, 143 f., 215, 301 f.
Albrecht Alcibiades (Margrave of Anspach-Culmbach), 378 f.
Albrecht Frederic (Duke of Prussia), 306–311
Amsdorf, Nicholas of, 19 f., 45, 290
Anabaptists, 166, 169, 178, 281 f., 360, 371
Andréä, James (chancellor), 40, 41, 43, 89 f., 311, 326
Anjou. *See* Henry III.
Anna Maria of Brunswick (Duchess of Prussia), 306
Augustus, Elector of Saxony, 37, 46, 55, 58, 75, 99, 119, 126 f., 132, 206, 213, 218 f., 319 f., 333, 338, 343, 346 f., 352, 358, 364 f., 382, 383, 389 f., 394–399
Aurifaber, John (court preacher), 41 (*n.* 4), 43, 221
Austria (House of). *See* Habsburg

BACH, VITUS (private lecturer), 297
Badvero, Federigo (ambassador), 94
Barnim XI. (Duke of Pomerania), 51, 138, 216
Barthold, Frederic William (historian), 111 (*n.* 2)
Basilius, Dr. (ambassador), 39
Baumgärtner, David (patrician), 389
Baumgärtner, Jerome (jurist), 71 (*n.* 3)
Beaucaire, Francis of (Bishop of Metz), 388
Belo, Joachim (preacher), 296
Benedictines, 176
Berghem, Rupert II. von (Bishop of Lüttich), 106 f.
Bernhard, St. of Clairvaux (Doctor of the Church), 266 (*n.* 1)
Bettendorf, Theodovich von (Bishop of Worms), 317, 321 (*n.* 1), 362
Beyer, Hans (confidential agent of John Frederic II.), 391, 398
Beza, Theodore, 189
Blochinger, Matthew (professor), 278
Bolwiller, Baron de, 320 (*n.* 1)
Boquin, Pierre (theologian), 67
Brandenstein, Colonel von, 395
Brandi (historian), 112 (*n.* 5)
Braunsberger, Otto, S.J., 40 (*n.* 2)
Brenz, John (theologian), 39 f., 43, 51, 77, 137, 224, 235 (*n.* 1), 243, 326
Brieger, Theodore (writer on church matters), 330 (*n.* 2)
Brück, Christian (ducal chancellor, son of the following), 148, 274, 377, 397
Brück, Greg. (Pontanus, actually Heintze, chancellor of the Saxon electorate), 37, 219, 397 f.

Brümmel, Pet. (burgomaster), 22 f., 25 f.
 Brünnner, Seb. (author), 155 (*n.* 1)
 Brus, Ant. (Archbishop of Prague), 235 (*n.* 1)
 Bruschius, Casp. (poly-historian), 172
 Buchholzer, George (provost), 57, 296 f.
 Büren, Dan von (burgomaster), 282
 Bugenhagen, (Pomeranus) John (preacher), 44
 Bullinger, Henry, 11 (*n.* 1), 31 (*n.* 1)
 Bussy d'Amboise, Jacques de Clermont de, 266 (*n.* 1)

CALVIN, Calvinism, Calvinists, 11 (*n.* 1), 31 (*n.* 1), 40, 67 f., 71, 75 f., 105 (*n.* 1), 141 (*n.* 1), 187, 191 f., 141, 143, 243, 275, 278, 283, 312, 315–328, 338 f., 345–352, 356, 363, 364 (*n.* 4)–376, 401
 Camerarius, Joachim (magister), 10, 143, 215, 306 (*n.* 4)
 Canisius, Peter, S.J., 30, 35, 58, 40, 43, 155, 170 (*n.* 3), 182
 Capito, Wolfgang Fabr. (preacher), 2
 Carmelites, 67
 Carpi, Rud. Pio (cardinal-dean), 271
 Casimir (Margrave of Brandenburg-Culmbach), 68
 Charles V. (Emperor), 29, 36, 85, 94, 104, 112, 218, 227, 279, 328
 Charles V. (Carolina), 161 (*n.* 3)
 Charles IX. (King of France), 263 f., 392 f.
 Charles II. (Margrave of Baden-Durlach), 47, 118, 216, 318 (*n.* 2), 323 f.
 Charles (Abbot of Metten), 172
 Charles Borromaeus, St., 335 (*n.* 1)
 Chemnitz, Martin (theologian), 290, 305, 376 (*n.* 2)
 Christian III. (King of Denmark), 39, 44, 47, 113, 280
 Christopher (Duke of Württemberg), 5, 39 (*n.* 4), 46 ff., 59, 73, 74–90, 98, 99, 103 f., 108 f., 117 ff., 124, 136 f., 150, 192, 206, 214, 225, 273, 317, 323, 325, 332 f., 339 f., 343, 348, 352, 357, 365, 372, 385
 Christopher (Duke of Mecklenburg), 113

Christopher (Bishop of Augsburg). *See* Stadion
 Christopher (Bishop of Brixen). *See* Fuchs
 Chytraeus, David (theologian), 51
 Cittardus (Citardus, or Zithard), Matthew (court preacher), 337, 351
 Clarisses, the, 82 f.
 Clement VII. (Pope), 218, 278
 Cleovitus. *See* Klebitz
 Commendone, Giov. Franc. (Cardinal-legate), 170 (*n.* 3), 193 f., 212, 223–232, 248 (*n.* 1), 334, 350
 Conrad (magister), 69
 Constantine the Great (Emperor), 201
 Contarini, Casp. (papal legate, formerly Venetian ambassador), 170
 Craco, George (privy councillor), 365, 397
 Cragius, Tilm. (superintendent), 28
 Cusano, Galeazzo (ambassador), 271 (*n.* 2)

DALCHAW, MAURICE (pastor), 291
 Daniel Brendel von Hamburg (Archbishop of Mayence), 238 f., 244, 252, 400
 Dasypodius, Theophilus, 275 (*n.* 1)
 Delfino, Zacharias (papal Nuncio, Bishop of Lesina), 209 f., 223 f., 230 f., 335
 Dienheim (the Lords of), 205 (*n.* 1)
 Diller (court preacher), 67
 Dominicans, the, 172
 Dominicanesses, the, 80, 85
 Dorothea of Denmark (Duchess of Prussia), 306
 Draconites, John (superintendent), 25
 Dronkemann (town clerk), 187
 Dudith, Andr. (Bishop of Brügge), 253
 Dürfeld, Christopher (jurist), 146

EAST FRIESLAND, Edzard II. (Count of), 283
 Eber, Paul (professor and superintendent-general), 143 (*n.* 1)
 Eck, Dr. John, 170, 172
 Eck, Leonard v. (chancellor), 176

Eck, Oswald v. (son of the chancellor), 176
 Ediger (Mongolian Chan), 112
 Egenolf (Franciscan), 151
 Eggerdes, Peter (preacher), 23
 Eichhorn, Ant., 334 (*n.* 2)
 Elizabeth (Queen of England), 72 f., 224, 336 (*n.* 1)
 Elizabeth of the Palatinate (Duchess of Sachsen), 310
 Emden (Count of). *See* East Friesland
 Entraigues, Catherine Henriette de Balzae d' (Mademoiselle, later Duchess of Verneuil), 266 (*n.* 1)
 Erasmus of Venningen (not Bennington) (court judge), 67, 71
 Erast, Thomas (professor of medicine), 67, 316
 Erbach, Valentin (Count of, counsellor of the Elector Palatine), 126
 Eric XIV. (King of Sweden), 392
 Ernest of Bavaria (Archbishop of Salzburg), 181
 Eyb, Gabriel (Bishop of Eichstädt), 170
 Francis II. (King of France), 110, 201
 Frederic IV., Count von Wied (Archbishop of Cologne), 252, 400
 Frederic II. (Elector Palatine), 60, 94, 98
 Frederic III. (the Pious), 57 f., 68, 108, 115, 122, 125 f., 131, 150, 191, 206, 214, 218–244, 245, 313–328, 333, 338–344, 345–356, 362–376, 377–400
 Frederic (Count Palatine of Zweibrücken), 47
 Frederic II. (Duke of Holstein-Glückstadt, King of Denmark), 392 (*n.* 2)
 Frederic (Bishop of Würzburg). *See* Wirsberg
 Freyberg, Paner. v. (court marshal), 176
 Fuchs, Christopher von (Bishop of Brixen), 153
 Fuchs von Rügheim, George (Bishop of Bamberg), 119, 379 (*n.* 1)
 Fünfkirchen, Herr von, 164
 Funk, John (court preacher), 302 f.

FABER, JOHN (Bishop of Vienna), 154
 Fabri, John (Dominican), 172
 Fabricius, Andr. (preacher), 8
 Falk, Francis (historian), 322 (*n.* 1)
 Ferdinand I. (King, then Emperor), 1, 29, 42, 47, 49, 82 f., 95, 98–102, 104 f., 107, 114–130, 134 f., 150 f., 155 f., 162, 165, 167, 177, 185 ff., 187, 195, 196–206, 210, 212, 218, 224, 231, 235–244, 248, 251, 253, 259, 262, 265–272, 329–343, 349, 379–384, 386
 Ferdinand II. (Archduke of Tyrol), 177
 Ferrier, Arn. de (French ambassador), 263
 Flacius, Matthew (styled Illyricus, controversial theologian), Flaccians, 11, 13, 19, 32, 39, 44, 48, 52, 57, 75, 139, 144, 147, 167, 178, 273 ff., 289 (*n.* 1), 298, 355, 387
 Flimmer, John (preacher), 72 (*n.* 3)
 Flinsbach, Cunman (preacher), 190
 Franciscans, or Minorites, 107, 151, 158, 329

GABRIEL (Bishop of Eichstädt). *See* Eyb
 Gallus, Nic. (superintendent), 31 f., 50 (*n.* 1), 56
 Gaudentius (Guggenbüchler, Franciscan), 173 (*n.* 5)
 Geller, Bernard (pastor), 291
 George of Austria (or Bishop of Brixen, Valencia, and Lüttich), 153
 George (the Bearded, Duke of Saxony), 256 f., 282
 George (Count Palatine of Pfalz-Simmern), 343
 George Frederic (Margrave of Brandenburg-Anspach), 39 (*n.* 4), 379 (*n.* 1)
 Gienger, George (justiciary), 200 f., 244 (*n.* 2)
 Gillet, J. F. A. (historian), 140 (*n.* 2)
 Götz, Walter (historian), 173 (*n.* 5)
 Gonzaga, Hercules (Cardinal of Mantua, first cardinal legate), 242
 Grassi, Charles (Bishop of Montefiascone), 264

Gressenicus, John (court preacher), 41
 Grumbach, William of (knight), 377-401
 Güldenstern (chancellor), 392
 Güttingen, Balth. von, 80
 Gustavus I. (King of Sweden), 113

HAAAG, COUNT VON, 176
 Habel, 341 (n. 1)
 Habsburg (House of), 117, 338, 380, 390
 Haenel, A. (jurist), 141 (n. 1)
 Hans (Margrave of Brandenburg-Cüstrin), 13, 34, 216, 332 f., 379 (n. 1), 392 (n. 2)
 Hardenberg (Rizaeus), Alb. (preacher), 140, 278
 Hattstein, Marquard von (Bishop of Spires), 320 (n. 1)
 Haugwitz, John IX. v. (Bishop of Meissen), 132
 Helding, Mich. (Bishop of Merseburg), 38 (n. 3), 134, 251
 Helmstadt, Jörg v. (commissioner), 87
 Henneberg, William VI. von (Count), 51
 Henry II. (King of France), 95, 107, 380
 Henry III. (Duke of Anjou, King of Poland and of France), 266 (n. 1)
 Henry the Younger (Duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel), 381
 Heppé, Henry Louis Jul. (church historian), 41 (n. 2)
 Hesshus, Tilman (theological controversialist), 21-28, 67-72, 280 f., 283-290, 307-312, 355, 376 (n. 2)
 Heusenstamm (Archbishop of Mayence). *See* Sebastian
 Hirn, Jos. (historian), 154 (n. 3), 330 (n. 2)
 Hofsess, Otto Leonard (abbot), 79
 Hoheuloh (Counts of), 85
 Hopfen (historian), 330 (n. 1), 331 (n. 1, 2), 336 (n. 2), 339 (n. 3), 350 (n. 2)
 Hornolt, Bart. (commissioner), 87
 Hosius, Stanislaus (Bishop of Ermeland, Cardinal), 202, 242, 334
 Hoya, Albert (*Graf zu*), 283

Huber, Sam., 370
 Hugel (superintendent), 146, 275

IVAN IV. ('the Terrible,' Czar), 111 ff.

JAMES III. VON ELTZ (Archbishop of Treves), 400 (n. 1)
 Janssen, Johannes, 330 (n. 2), 336 (n. 2)
 Jesuits, 30, 35, 38, 40, 43, 155, 159, 173 (n. 5), 182, 185, 232 (n. 1), 241, 244 (n. 2), 255 (n. 1), 304 (n. 1)
 Joachim II. (Margrave of Brandenburg, Elector), 37, 47, 115, 119, 127, 138, 206, 213, 216, 224, 230 f., 293-300, 333, 338, 340, 347, 365, 379 (n. 1), 393
 Joachim III. (Prince of Anhalt-Dessau), 34, 135
 John V. of Isenburg (Archbishop of Treves), 37
 John VI. v. d. Leyen (Archbishop of Treves), 185, 187, 189, 238, 252, 336
 John the Elder (Duke of Holstein-Hundersleben), 392
 John of Leyden (Anabaptist), 283
 John a Via (cathedral preacher), 41, 42 (n. 2)
 John Casimir (Count Palatine of Neustadt and Lautern), 263 (n. 2)
 John Frederic (the Magnanimous, Elector of Saxony), 37, 137, 388
 John Frederic II. ('der Mittlere,' Duke of Saxe-Gotha), 15 (n. 1), 31 (n. 1), 43, 52, 58, 68, 108, 117, 121, 144, 150, 206, 214, 224, 274, 314 f., 348, 377, 379, 384, 386-396, 400 f.
 John Frederic III. (Duke of Saxe-Gotha), 54 ff., 388
 John Gebhard, Count of Mansfeld (Archbishop of Cologne), 238, 244, 251, 336
 John George (Electoral Prince, later Elector of Brandenburg), 379 (n. 1)
 John William (Duke of Saxe-Weimar), 54, 245, 348, 394-396
 John St., Knights of, 117

Jonas, Justus the younger (professor of law), 45, 145

Judex, Matthew (theologian), 7 (n. 1), 275, 285 f.

Julius (Duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel), 36

Jungen, Anton zum (delegate), 96 (n. 2)

Jungen, Daniel zum, 110, 121, 130 (n. 1)

Jungnitz, Jos. (director of archives), 245 (n. 2)

KARGE, GEORGE (superintendent), 39 (n. 4)

Kasimir. *See* Casimir.

Kern, John V. (Abbot of St. George), 79

Ketteler, Gotthard v. (Duke of Currland and Semgall, grandmaster), 113, 116

Khienburg, Michael, Count of (Archbishop of Salzburg), 80, 119, 181, 331

Khuen-Belasy, John James (Archbishop of Salzburg), 239, 244 (n. 2)

Kirchmair, George, 154

Klebitz (Cleovitus), William (deacon), 68 f., 400

Kleindienst, Barthol. (doctor and convert), 8

Knöpfler, Alvis (church historian), 173 (n. 5)

Knolles, Henry (ambassador), 336 (n. 1)

Koch, Henry (historian), 248 (n. 1)

Koch, Matthew (historian), 400

Kretzer, Christopher, 379 (n. 2)

Kütze, Ernest (pastor), 292

LAINEZ, JAMES (General of the Jesuits), 40, 43, 155 (n. 3), 241, 244

Latomus (Latimer), Barthol., 42 (n. 2)

Laymingen, Achaz v. (Truchsess), 176

Leib, Kilian, 169 (n. 2)

Lemnius, Sim. Emporius (poet), 281

Lessing, Gotthold Ephr., 400

Lindemann (privy counsellor), 365, 368, 375

Lisch, Eg. Christian Fred. (historian), 161 (n. 3)

Loserth (historian), 330 (n. 2)

Louis (Duke of Bavaria), 168, 257, 260

Luna (Count, Spanish ambassador), 95

Luther, Lutheran, Lutheranism, 7, 10, 12 f., 19, 21, 31, 35, 40, 43 f., 48, 53, 56, 61, 63, 66 f., 68 f., 76 f., 79, 81, 90, 113, 139, 146, 148, 151, 157, 166, 170, 178, 181, 184, 192, 208, 220, 246 f., 257, 274, 280, 293, 297, 311, 313, 322, 324 f., 338, 343, 353, 361, 370, 376, 386, 391, 401

MADRUZZI, CHRISTOPHER (Cardinal, Prince-bishop of Trent and Brixen, nephew of the following), 153, 236

Madruzzzi, Louis (Prince-bishop of Trent), 110

Major, George (professor), Majorites, 17–22, 33 f., 38, 44, 53, 166, 275, 277, 293, 355

Mandelsloe, Ernest v., 382, 384, 390, 395, 401

Marbach, John (theologian), 41, 71

Maria of Spain (Queen of Bohemia, afterwards Empress), 155

Maria of Brandenburg-Culmbach (Electress of the Palatinate), 68, 221

Marini, Leonard, O. Pr. (Bishop of Lanciano), 240

Martello, Lud., 236

Martyr. *See* Peter

Maurenbrecher, Carl Pet. Will. (historian), 330 (n. 2)

Maurice (Elector of Saxony), 94, 202, 224

Maximilian I. (Emperor), 94

Maximilian II. (King, later Emperor), 34 f., 104, 201, 206, 259, 329–344, 386–395, 400

Medici, John Angelo. *See* Pius IV.

Melanchthon, Melanchthonianers (Philipists), 10, 13 f., 29, 33, 36 f., 39 f., 43–45, 46–48, 67, 75 f., 98, 135, 137, 140–143, 163, 166, 217, 221, 275, 293, 294, 302, 325

Melander, William, 95

Menius, Justus (superintendent), 19 f., 302 (*n.* 2)
 Menzel, Charles (historian), 62
 Menzel, Charles Adolphus (historian), 401
 Meyendorf, Andreas v. (nobleman), 290, 308, 310
 Meyerin, Anton. (pastor), 291
 Minckwitz (chancellor), 67
 Moller, Cyriacus (pastor), 292
 Mörlin, Joachim (Bishop of Samland), 13, 15 (*n.* 1), 33, 273, 305, 307
 Morone, Johannes (Nuncio, Cardinal-legate), 184, 265, 270
 Müller, Andreas (pastor), 291
 Mundt, Christopher (ambassador), 336 (*n.* 1)
 Musäus, Simon (professor), 146, 275, 284
 Musculus (Meusel), Andreas (theologian), 294–301, 355

NASSAU, LOUIS (Count of), 383 (*n.* 1)
 Nassau, William (Count of). *See* Orange
 Nausea, Frederick (Bishop of Vienna), 155 (*n.* 1), 251
 Navarre. *See* Henry IV.
 Nussbaum, Leonard (councillor), 189

ECOLAMPADIUS, 373
 Oemes, Otto (pastor), 288
 Oldenburg (Counts of), 283
 Olevian, Caspar (preacher and professor), 188–192 (*n.* 1), 316 f.
 Orange, William I. (Count of Nassau-Dollenburg, Prince of), 227 (*n.* 1), 383 (*n.* 1)
 Ortenburg (Counts of), 176
 Osiander, Andreas, Osianderites, 12–17, 21, 33, 38 f., 48, 53, 55, 140, 166, 293, 302–307, 355
 Ossa, Melchior v., 184
 Otto, Henry (Elector Palatine), 33, 47, 59, 60, 66, 99, 125, 131, 206 (*n.* 3)

PAUL III. (Pope), 133, 242, 251 (*n.* 2)
 Paul IV. (Pope), 49, 105, 121, 196, 329

Paul, St. (Apostle), 19, 44, 229, 297 (*n.* 1)
 Paul, Nic. (historian), 9 (*n.* 1), 173 (*n.* 5), 330 (*n.* 2), 336 (*n.* 2), 339 (*n.* 3)
 Pettram, Hans, 164
 Peter Martyr, 105 (*n.* 1), 243 f.
 Peucer, Caspar, 71 (*n.* 3), 143, 302
 Pfaff, K. (historian), 88 (*n.* 1)
 Pfefferkorn v. Ottobach Sal., 163
 Pfeil (Syndicus), 284
 Pflug, Julius (Bishop of Naumburg), 38, 251
 Philibert (Margrave of Baden), 321 f., 361, 365
 Philip II. (King of Spain), 94, 173 (*n.* 5), 197, 201, 261, 265, 332, 335, 393
 Philip I. (Landgrave of Hesse), 5, 14, 31, 47, 57, 100, 108, 119, 135, 139, 144, 190, 214, 221, 237, 322 (*n.* 1), 333, 346
 Pius IV. (Pope), 150, 167, 195, 196–204, 209 f., 223, 226–245, 254, 261, 269, 334, 339 (*n.* 2), 342
 Pius V. (Pope), 350
 Planck, G. J., 42 (*n.* 2)
 Polanco, Johannes, S.J., 155 (*n.* 2)
 Prætorius, Abdias (professor), 294–298
 Prætorius, Alexius (superintendent), 19
 Preger, K. (historian), 173 (*n.* 5)
 Puchheim, Adam v., 162

RAESFELD, BERNARD (Bishop of Münster), 252 (*n.* 1)
 Ranke, Leop. v. (historian), 173 (*n.* 5)
 Reidt, John v., S.J., 185, 232 (*n.* 1), 255 (*n.* 1)
 Reimann (historian), 330 (*n.* 2)
 Reitzes (historian), 330 (*n.* 2)
 Resch, Hippol. (commissioner), 87
 Riccardo (Abbot of Vercelli), 241
 Riezler, Sigmund (chief librarian), 173 (*n.* 5)
 Ritter, Maurice (historian), 367 (*n.* 3)
 Rosny, Maximilian de Bethune, Baron de (Duke of Sully), 266 (*n.* 1)
 Roth (preacher), 396
 Rothenhäusler, K. (historian), 88 (*n.* 1)

Rudolph II. (Archduke, later Emperor), 335
 Rüssow (chronicler), 112
 Rupert of Pfalz-Zweibrücken (Count Palatine), 2
 Rupert II. *See* Bergheim

SALENTIN, Count of Isenburg (Archbishop of Cologne), 401
 Sarecius, Erasmus, 39
 Saxony (House of), 387, 397
 Scalichius, Paul, 302 f.
 Scherer, George, S.J., 160
 Schlecht, Jos. (historian), 338 (n. 2)
 Schlegel (doctor), 297 (n. 1)
 Schltter, Joachim (preacher), 25
 Schmidlin. *See* Andreä, James
 Schnepf, Dietr., 89
 Schnepf, Erhard (preacher), 33, 39 (n. 2)
 Schröter (physician), 148
 Schwarzburg, Günther (Count of, military general), 227 (n. 1), 390, 397
 Schwenckfeld, Schwenckfeldians, 53, 74, 141, 166, 275, 355
 Schwendi, Lazarus von, 98
 Sebastian v. Heusenstamm (Archbishop of Mayence), 184 (n. 2)
 Seckendorf, Anna von (prioress), 318
 Seiboltsdorf, Jerome v., 176
 Seiler, Fred., 223
 Seld (vice-chancellor), 105
 Servet, Mich., 58, 140
 Sickingen, Francis of, 162, 379, 384
 Sigismund (Emperor), 201
 Sigismund v. Brandenburg (Archbishop of Magdeburg), 232, 286 f.
 Sigismund II., Augustus (King of Poland), 113, 233
 Slatkonia, George (Bishop of Vienna), 151
 Solyman II. (Sultan), 98, 112
 Soranzo, Girol. (ambassador), 271
 Soriano, Mich. (ambassador), 95, 118
 Speratus, Paul (preacher), 151
 Stadion, Christopher von (Bishop of Augsburg), 184
 Stancar(us), 53, 166
 Staphylus, Fred. (convert), 42 (n. 2), 156, 244 (n. 2)

Stein, William von, 382, 390, 396
 Steuss, Peter (burgomaster), 188
 Stieve, Felix (historian), 173 (n. 5), 330 (n. 2)
 Stolberg (und Königstein), Louis (Count of), 110
 Strele, Barthol. (chaplain), 288
 Strigel, Victorin (theologian), 145, 275, 355
 Sturio (deacon), 44
 Sudhoff, K., 37 (n. 1)

TAUSENDSCÖHN, HANS (seer of angels), 381 f., 386 f., 394, 398
 Teutonic Order, 112 f., 117, 306
 Thanner, Theob., 141
 Thann, Eberhard v. d. (ambassador), 121
 Theodosius (emperor), 274
 Thou, James Aug. d. (Thuanus), 253 (n. 1)
 Truchsess, Otto v. (Cardinal-Bishop of Augsburg), 30, 109, 196, 207, 210, 212, 232, 236 f., 254, 262, 271, 363

ULRICH (Duke of Mecklenburg), 23, 216, 218
 Ulrich (Duke of Württemberg), 46, 77, 82, 86, 136
 Ursinus (actually Beer), Zacharias (professor), 315

VALOIS, CHARLES OF, 266 (n. 1)
 Velderer, Louis (Abbot of Hirschau), 79
 Venningen, Erasmus of (court judge), 67, 71
 Verger, 331
 Verona (the pretended Margrave). *See* Scalichius
 Vohezer, Jos. (keeper of archives), 237 (n. 1)
 Voit, David (professor), 306
 Vulpius, Christian Aug. (author), 304 (n. 1)

WALTER, FRED. (historian), 330 (n. 2)
 Weidling, Caspar (highway robber), 399 (n. 1)

Wesenbeck, Matthew (professor), 146
 Westphal(us), Joachim (theologian), 13, 58
 Wiechmann, C. M., 7 (*n.* 1)
 Wiedemann, Theodore (historian), 161 (*n.* 3)
 Wigand, John (Bishop of Pomesania), 19, 146, 275, 285, 307 ff., 355
 William IV. (Duke of Bavaria), 168, 171, 173, 257, 260
 William (Duke of Jülich-Cleves), 248 (*n.* 1)
 William of Brandenburg (Archbishop of Riga), 113
 William of Orange. *See* Orange
 William (Abbot of Fulda), 182 f.
 Winter (superintendent), 146

Wirsberg, Fred. of (Prince-Bishop of Wirzburg), 382, 393
 Wolf (historian), 210 (*n.* 4)
 Wolfgang (Abbot of Fulda), 183
 Wolfgang (Abbot of Metten), 172
 Wolfgang (Count Palatine of Zweibrücken), 33, 47, 110, 192, 215, 323, 343, 347 ff., 352, 365, 372
 Wolfgang (Prince of Anhalt-Göthen), 51

ZASIUS, ULRICH (Imperial councillor), 118, 369, 376
 Zobel, Melchior (Bishop of Würzburg), 119, 378
 Zwingli, Zwinglians, 33, 53, 61, 67, 72, 75, 137, 166, 178, 188, 215, 315, 324, 331, 341, 344, 347, 366, 375

END OF THE SEVENTH VOLUME

